[For a discussion of Soviet policy vis-à-vis Rumania, as exemplified in the establishment of the Moldavian Soviet Republic and the annexation of Rumanian Bessarabia, see 21; Kolarz, Rl Soviet Union, category 116, pp. 150-152. Bibliographic notes appear on pp. 161-162.]

113, 648

ED1 Rumania

[For the text of the Treaty of Guarantee between Poland and Rumania, signed at Geneva, January 15, 1931, see EA1 Poland, 31: Retinger, Category 116, pp. 237-239.]

113, 439, 648 Rumania EDl

[For a discussion of the nature, scope and probable future trends (up to 1970) of Soviet economic relations with the East European satellites since World War II, and the degree of inter-satellite economic integration, see 60: Bergson, Rl Soviet Union, category 116, pp. 321-355]

113, 423, 474 Rumania EDl

[For information pertaining cooperative farms and collectivization, see 5; Free Europe Committee, El Europe, category 116, pp. 65, 68-71. -- Analyst]

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

I

PEASANT AGAINST LANDOWNER

The Peasant Revolt of 1907

175
668

IN MARCH, 1907, the peasants in northern Moldavia, not far from the Russian frontier, arose in revolt.[1] Initially the uprising was directed, perhaps as a result of anti-Semitic instigation, against certain Jewish tenants renting large estates, but in its rapid extension south and west into Muntenia and along the Danube into Oltenia it became an increasingly violent assault upon all large tenant farmers and absentee landowners. The peasants not only demanded an amelioration of their labor contracts but in some districts seized land and organized revolutionary bands. The poorer peasants, those with insufficient holdings to support themselves, seem to have been the first to revolt, but they were soon joined by the more prosperous villagers. Indeed, subsequent investigations revealed that the active heads of the movement, in so far as it received any direction, had been village leaders, ex-army sergeants, clerks, and schoolteachers.[2]

For a time neither the central authorities in Bucarest nor the local administrations were able to cope with the spreading unrest, but after the dismissal of the Conservatives a Liberal government, perhaps under the threat of foreign intervention by Austria, took vigorous countermeasures. Troops under General Averescu, later a war hero and political figure, descended on the countryside and after some sharp conflicts restored order. Reprisals in districts where there had been peasant violence were extremely severe. It has been estimated that upward of 11,000 peasants were killed in the course of the revolt and its suppression.

Although the uprising lasted less than a month and was completely subdued, it was, and was felt to be, an event of frightening significance. Here was no by-product of foreign invasion, the frequent

[13]

1. For an account of the revolt see Radu Rosetti, *Pentru ce s'au răsculat ţăranii* (Bucarest, 1908). A recent novel by Leo Katz, *Seedtime* (New York, 1947), is based on this uprising. Many aspects of the revolt are obscure, and the dossiers relating to its suppression are reported to have disappeared subsequently from the Ministry of War. In 1948, however, under the auspices of the Groza government, Mihail Roller edited a collection of state documents regarding the 1907 uprising. This new material, which may contain important additional information, was not available when this chapter was written.

2. C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea, *Neoiobăgia* (Bucarest, 2d ed., n.d.), p. 204.

[1 is blank]

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

175 what has been called "the most questionable act of King Ferdinand's
185 reign."[7] Although peasant disturbances, general instability, and
423 the inexperience of the Vaida government have been cited as reasons for its downfall, it seems clear that its dismissal stemmed directly from the hostility of the landowners to the proposed agrarian bill.[8] Thus, the effort of the Peasant party to carry through a more radical reform by legal means was defeated.

The new premier, General Averescu, was selected because he was a popular military hero. He immediately ordered new elections and by the usual controls was able to obtain a majority for his People's party. Mihalache was replaced by Constantin Garoflid. Garoflid, as has been seen, was by no means opposed to land reform, but he did not approve of the emphasis upon large-scale expropriation and the creation of a multitude of small holdings. It was his task, however, to complete a measure based upon principles he had always attacked.

423 The second land reform law for the Old Kingdom was promulgated on July 17, 1921. Although primarily concerned with allotting land and resettling the peasants, it also extended expropriation to obtain the 450,000 hectares lacking after the 1918 decree-law. Expropriation was now based on proprietors rather than properties, and the old sliding scale was abandoned in favor of a more elastic measure which took account of regional geographic differences and relative land hunger.[9] Land left to the proprietor was to be determined at once,

● [113]

7. R. W. Seton-Watson, *History of the Roumanians* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 551.

8. The attitude of the landowners at this time is shown in a circular distributed by the Union of Syndicates of Moldavian Landowners: "We, landowners, are firmly determined to oppose by all means, and especially by impeaching before the Court of Cassation, all those provisions of the decree-law of 1918, of the law for communal grazing, and of any future law or decree, which may conflict with the letter of the Constitution regarding the expropriation of land . . . To re-consecrate the intangible right of property, we demand that a law shall be passed which shall punish with hard labor for life whomsoever shall speak of expropriation again." Quoted in Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

9. Land was left to the proprietors on the following basis:

	Land cultivated by owner (hectares)	*Land cultivated by owner with important capital investments (hectares)*
In highlands and hills	100	100
In plains, where demand for land was great	150	200
In plains, where demand for land was moderate	200	300
In plains, where demand for land was satisfied	250	500

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

it appears that in eastern Europe the birth rate has begun to decline, but its effect will not be reflected in the population for a number of years.

The decline of the death rate in the West resulted from the numerous social, hygienic, and nutritional improvements gradually introduced and disseminated over the last two centuries, all of which were slow in reaching eastern Europe. The subsequent fall in the Western birth rate appears to have been largely a conscious social restriction and not any decline in "national virility." [2] It generally accompanies a rise in living conditions and has shown a direct correlation with class differences.

The extent to which those factors bringing about the growth of population in the West apply to eastern Europe is not known with certainty. The fall in the eastern European death rate after the middle of the nineteenth century appears to have corresponded with the introduction of some of the social and hygienic improvements from the West, but it may also have resulted from a moderate improvement in internal and external security at a somewhat earlier date.[3]

Birth and death rates for Greater Rumania showed a decline during the interwar years, largely a result of drops in the rural rates. The rural birth rate in 1936, however, was still well above that of the towns (33.8 per thousand as against 21.4). The rate of natural increase, the excess of births over deaths, also displayed a perceptible decline, from over 14 per thousand inhabitants in the early 1920's to about 11 in the late 1930's. The birth rate fell greatly during the Second World War (to a low of 19.9 in 1945) and seems to have increased only slightly in the postwar years. The death rate having remained approximately the same, the rate of growth of Rumania's population has diminished tremendously under the exceptional conditions of the past decade.

Agricultural Overpopulation

While Rumania's over-all density of population is not very high as compared with that of western Europe, most of the people live on the land, and the agricultural population is quite dense. In 1941 the agricultural population of Rumania (minus Bessarabia, Northern Bucovina, Northern Transylvania, and Southern Dobrogea) represented 71.4 per cent of the total population and 94.4 per cent of the

2. Dudley Kirk, *Europe's Population in the Interwar Years* (League of Nations, 1946), p. 88.

3. A. M. Carr-Saunders, *World Population: Past Growth and Present Trends* (Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 80.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

rural population.[4] There were 94.3 inhabitants of the agricultural population for every 100 hectares of agricultural land in private hands (including arable surface, meadow, vineyards, orchards, and pastures). Agricultural population was densest in the poor mountainous areas, in contrast to total population which was densest in the plains; in the Oltenian and Muntenian Carpathians 121.5 agricultural inhabitants occupied every 100 hectares of agricultural land in private hands, 112.8 in the Moldavian Carpathians and 108.3 in Bucovina.

That the density of Rumania's agricultural population was relatively high is shown in the following table, comparing Rumania (on the basis of earlier and somewhat different statistics) with other eastern European and some of the western European countries:[5]

Country	*Density of population dependent upon agriculture per square kilometer of "arable-equivalent" * agricultural land, ca. 1930.*
RUMANIA	79.7
Old Kingdom	79.9
Bessarabia	69.7
Bucovina	145.9
Transylvania	81.3
Bulgaria	95.4
Greece	86.7
Yugoslavia	100.1
Hungary	68.1
Poland	86.9
Austria	64.2
Czechoslovakia	59.4
Italy	53.4
Germany	52.1
France	28.8
Netherlands	81.7
Denmark	37.5
England and Wales	33.8

* "Arable-equivalent" is a statistical device to achieve a rough comparability between different types of land (arable, pasture, vineyards, etc.) used for agricultural purposes. A hectare of pasture land is clearly not equivalent to a hectare of arable.

The director of the Rumanian Central Institute of Statistics, in interpreting the results of the 1930 census, concluded that "These

4. Institutul Central de statistică, *Recensământal agricol al României din 1941* (Bucarest, 1945), Table 21.

5. Wilbert E. Moore, *Economic Demography of Eastern and Southern Europe* (League of Nations, 1945), pp. 197–204.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

figures permit one to affirm that our country has arrived at the saturation point, and even at an agricultural overpopulation." [6] The term "overpopulation," however, has been subject to numerous interpretations and must be used cautiously.[7] In particular, in Rumania the issue of overpopulation has been too frequently brandished as a political weapon for contending parties.

Surplus population is sometimes defined in terms of an "optimum" population, one that achieves the maximum per capita real income. In such a case overpopulation would mean that a withdrawal of population from the land would increase per capita income since the marginal productivity of the surplus cultivators, given the law of diminishing returns, is less than the average per capita productivity. Apart from the manifold difficulties of determining such an optimum, this approach is somewhat artificial in the case of eastern Europe, where the problem of overpopulation is concerned not with any ideal optimum but with a possible Malthusian nightmare of mass suffocation. To be meaningful in this connection overpopulation must indicate that in some way more people are engaged in agriculture than are required for the type of cultivation prevailing, that they could be withdrawn from the soil without loss in agricultural production, the output of the surplus population being less than the loss occasioned by their presence (soil destruction, irrational holdings, etc.).[8]

It is clear that density alone does not determine overpopulation in this sense, since the Netherlands, for example, had a slightly higher agricultural density than Rumania but with entirely different social and economic consequences because of an intensive form of cultivation. The level of agricultural productivity, expressed in yield per unit of area is also a factor. That is, output per capita (C), which ultimately determines the level of existence, is equivalent to yield per unit of area (Y) divided by the density of agricultural population (D): $C = \frac{Y}{D}$.

Now for purposes of general orientation it is possible to make a rough comparison of this equation for Rumania with that for

6. Sabin Manuila, *Structure et évolution de la population rurale* (Bucarest, 1940), p. 17.

7. For discussions of the definition of overpopulation see Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 55–77; Carr-Saunders, *op. cit.*, pp. 330–331; and "The Problem of Surplus Agricultural Population," *International Journal of Agrarian Affairs*, *1*, No. 1 (October, 1939); the entire issue is devoted to articles on the question.

8. If overpopulation is not defined in some such sense as this, it is necessary to consider alternative means of employment for the surplus population, unless the surplus is to be physically liquidated. This problem will be discussed presently in connection with town and country relations.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

				Hectares (*in 1936*)	*Per Cent*
Total area 29,505,000 hectares	A. Agricultural area	1.	Arable	13,940,000	47.3
		a.	Cereals	11,609,000	
		b.	Alimentary plants	532,000	
		c.	Industrial plants	498,000	
		d.	Cultivated or artificial meadows (forage crops)	783,000	
		e.	Fallow	523,000	
		2.	Natural meadows	1,410,000	4.7
		3.	Grazing and pasture	2,448,000	8.3
		4.	Vineyards	328,000	1.1
		5.	Orchards	233,000	0.8
	B. Nonagricultural area	1.	Woods and forests	6,449,000	21.9
		2.	Occupied land (yards, houses, streets and roads, cities, industrial and commercial land) and nonproductive	4,697,000	15.9

tion may be held on lease or in metayage. The statistics always show some difference between the two; in most cases large properties are more extensive than large exploitations, an indication that a portion of the large properties is being leased. A secondary distinction between privately owned and state or publicly owned properties is also important, and here again Rumanian statistics are often inconsistent.

Although official accounts of the results of the 1918–21 land reforms were issued by the Rumanian government, they are not a very reliable guide to the effect of these reforms on the distribution of agricultural property. About 6,000,000 hectares were reported to have been expropriated, of which about 3,900,000 hectares were distributed to some 1,393,000 peasants, or 69.5 per cent of those having a claim to land.[16] But while the land reform was supposed to have been completed around 1929–30, in 1940 it was officially announced that the reform was not yet terminated: 3,900 estates were still in possession of land which was to have been expropriated; 434,000 hectares of expropriated land had not even been surveyed for distribution; 440,000 hectares had not yet been divided; 900 law cases re-

16. Alexander Nasta, "La Réforme agraire en Roumanie," report presented to the Fourteenth Congress of the International Congress of Agriculture (Bucarest, June 7–10, 1929), p. 16; Biblioteca de Sociologie, Etică şi Politică, condusă de D. Gusti, *60 Sate romînești* (5 vols., Bucarest, 1941–43), II, 10.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

of less than one hectare were several hundred meters long and only 5 to 10 meters wide. The strips were at a great distance from one another, some authorities estimating the average distance to be from 4 to 7 kilometers.[36] The division of farming units into such small strips is obviously an impediment to any rationalization of agriculture.

Primitive techniques and irrational organization of holdings, while directly responsible for low productivity, are really manifestations rather than causes of the stagnation of Rumanian agriculture. What has inhibited the introduction of technical and organizational improvements? Poverty and "lack of capital" merely describe the situation; they do not explain it. Nor can this stagnation be ascribed to the natural inertia of a primitive agricultural society: the Rumanian economy has been in the midst of a dynamic process of change for over a century.

The fall in yield after the agrarian reforms of 1918–21 naturally raised the question whether the expropriation of the large estates was responsible for the critical state of Rumanian farming. This question is likely to be misleading if it is reduced to a comparison of the theoretical merits of large scale and peasant agriculture. Criticism that the agrarian reforms are responsible for the decline in agricultural productivity is apt to assume that the pre-1914 estates were well-organized large farms, whereas for the most part they were latifundiary cultivations, farmed out to the peasants who cultivated them with their own animals and equipment.[37] To be sure, some of the large farms were relatively well managed (although the yield even on the big estates was low in comparison with western European standards), and it may be that certain other controls employed by the large farms—notably the selection of seed and the regulation of the date at which sowing should begin [38]—were sufficient to account for the higher yield of the large properties. During the interwar years, as before 1914, large farms continued to have a higher cereal

36. M. Gormsen, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

37. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in a study of Rumanian agriculture, cites the great annual fluctuation in the wheat yield, a result of the variation in rainfall, as an example of the inability of the small peasant to take appropriate moisture conservation measures. "Managers of the large estates knew how to overcome this handicap to a considerable extent." U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, *op. cit.*, p. 715. A comparison of pre-1914 yields, however, indicates that while the yield of large properties was higher than that of small properties, the fluctuation in yield was practically the same for both categories. Cf. Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

38. Doreen Warriner, *The Economics of Peasant Farming* (Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 153.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

241 yield than the small peasant holdings,[39] though there appear to be
311 no satisfactory statistics on this point.

On the other hand, defenders of the agrarian reform and small peasant properties have tended to assume that the Rumanian small holder was on his way to becoming an independent peasant proprietor, a doubtful assumption in view of the prevalence of dwarf holdings and the continued excessive cultivation of cereals. In 1937 G. Ionescu-Sișești and N. Cornățeanu upheld the reform and peasant farming on the following grounds:

The reform was an economic necessity under the conditions of devastation after the First World War; it was only by giving land to the peasants that they were induced to make the great effort necessary for agricultural recovery. Peasant farming became more intensive and less devoted to cereal cultivation. The peasant was better able to withstand agricultural crises, largely because the large farmer lacked his ability to reduce expenses and increase family labor. Finally, peasant agriculture should not be judged in terms of its contribution to the national income but by its ability to "assure the existence of the greatest possible number of citizens." It is therefore erroneous to "establish a comparison between peasant agriculture and the system of large property." [40]

311 The necessity of the agrarian reforms need not be argued, although
185 they could be defined more convincingly as a social than as an economic imperative (i.e., the peasants would have refused to continue to work under the old system). It may also be true that peasant farming cannot be judged by narrow profit-and-loss accounting methods, since it is a manner of living as well as a form of livelihood. But Sișești's and Cornățeanu's supporting arguments do not appear relevant to the actual Rumanian situation. There is no indication that peasant cultivation did become to any significant degree more intensive and varied. The examples they give, taken from a survey of a number of farms between 1930 and 1934, to illustrate the viability of peasant farming are not representative but comprise farms well above the average size for Rumania. Hence the real problem of dwarf holdings is avoided. The argument that small holdings are more resistant to crises because the peasant is able to restrict his consumption and increase family labor is not altogether reassuring in face of the growing pressure of population, regardless of its dubi-

39. M. Gormsen, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
40. G. Ionescu-Sișești and N. Cornățeanu, *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie et ses conséquences* (Bucarest, 1937), pp. 42–58.

113

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

ous merits from the point of view of social welfare. The effort to ignore the importance of national income as a criterion for judging the advantages of peasant farming is unrealistic, given the existence of a modern Rumanian state with its manifold requirements. Finally, for all their optimism, Sișești and Cornățeanu admit the serious menace of continued subdivision of the land and urge the creation of a "peasant bourgeoisie." They do not indicate, however, what is to become of the poor peasants displaced in such a creation except to appeal for a further expansion of a national industry. The appeal to national industry, as a *deus ex machina*, at once undermines the whole argument for the viability of the Rumanian peasant proprietor.

Actually, such discussions of the merits and defects of peasant agriculture have only a limited relevance in Rumania. For example, in a study of 275 peasant households made in 1938, it was discovered that in general both the gross income per hectare (the total agricultural product of the holding, whether consumed or sold) and the agricultural income per hectare (gross income minus expenses for agriculture—labor payments, inventory, buildings, seed, etc.) tended to be higher on the small (under 3 hectares) than on the larger holdings. This higher net yield would appear to substantiate the contentions of the advocates of small farming.[41] In fact, however, the majority of the small holdings in this investigation operated at a deficit because the consumption needs of the household, largely food and clothing, were greater than the farm could produce. Only 14 per cent of the holdings between 1 and 3 hectares had an agricultural income greater than consumption, whereas in 86 per cent of the cases consumption was greater. Only 30 per cent of the holdings between 3 and 5 hectares had agricultural incomes greater than consumption. On the larger farms, between 10 and 20 hectares, 59 per cent had an agricultural income sufficient to meet consumption needs.[42] Therefore, the relative net incomes of farms of different sizes were of less

41. This higher rate of agricultural income among the small holdings is not, as it might appear, in contradiction to the statement that the cereal yield is higher on large farms than on small. A much smaller proportion of the income of the small holdings is derived from cereals; most of it comes from the sale of animals, fowls, fruits, etc. This, however, does not really represent a turn to intensive farming, since it is conducted on a very primitive level and only reflects the dwarf holder's efforts to maintain himself at a subsistence level.

42. *60 Sate românești*, II, 292. It should be noted that this investigation did not include large farms but only peasant holdings up to 40 hectares. Moreover, the results of the investigation showed an extremely wide range of variation, both regionally and among farms of the same size. Hence, the sampling may not have been extensive enough to permit confident generalization.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

and services than it gave, the difference being gained by the towns.[9] According to these views, trade relations were actually detrimental to the rural areas, which were being drained by the towns and industries.

It is not necessary here to discuss the theoretical question whether there is any absolute disadvantage to the countryside in its commerce with the towns. If during a period of change toward industrialization the countryside's position declines in relation to the town, it is quite possible for a number of other factors—which may be "short term" or even noneconomic—to convert this relative disadvantage into an absolute loss in income. Such factors may include the inelasticity of agricultural supply, the immobility of agricultural labor, and the increase in agricultural population. Finally, governmental and political policies may favor industry at the expense of agriculture. This last point requires further elucidation, as it was quite important in Rumania.

Rumanian industry was created in the shelter of high protective tariffs, which undoubtedly served to increase the costs of agriculture and to benefit industry at its expense. These tariffs have been justified by the "infant industries" argument, and in part they were brought about by the agricultural protectionist policy of the European industrial states. But the combination of protectionism and the development of cartels did give industry a monopolistic position in the internal Rumanian market which worked to the disadvantage of agriculture. In addition to tariff protection, Rumania had a long tradition of direct encouragements to industry—such as exemptions from taxation and special transport rates—which persisted in the interwar period and were expanded in the 1930's.

The protective tariffs, by restricting foreign imports, had the effect of bringing in foreign capital for investment in local industry. But while foreign capital has been of great importance in the development of Rumania's larger industries and in the creation of its transportation system, the effect on the total economy has been somewhat one-sided, partly because the capital was naturally attracted to industries working for export: "Without depreciating the influence of foreign capital in stimulating industrialization, it is to be underlined that the benefits of invested foreign capital do not for the most part serve to create purchasing power in the national market

9. M. Manoilescu, "Das wirtschaftliche und soziale Dreieck der Agrarstaaten: die Stadt, das Dorf, das Ausland," *Internationale Agrarrundschau*, No. 6 (Berlin, 1940), also cited in Hugo Böker, "Agriculture's Share in the National Income and the Agricultural Situation," *International Review of Agriculture*, 32, No. 1 (January, 1941), 22. For a discussion of M. Manoilescu's views, see below, pp. 193–197.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

433 and do not contribute to increasing the supply of capital, since they
651 are exported." [10]

457 A comparison of industrial manufacture, industrial imports, and
433 consumption of manufactured goods between 1927 and 1938 shows that while the percentage of industrial consumption which was provided for by Rumanian industry rose from 63.5 per cent to 78.6 per cent, the total consumption of industrial products dropped from about 93 billion lei in 1927 to 88 billion lei in 1938. That is, the increase in industrial production (from 59 to 69 billion lei) was more than balanced by the fall in industrial imports (from 34 to 19 billion lei).[11]

From this the conclusion might be drawn that Rumanian industrialization, instead of increasing purchasing power, was reducing it. Such indeed was Madgearu's opinion: "It is certain that the position of quasi-monopoly created by the system of protection of the national industry is the principal cause of the state of inferiority into which agriculture in general and peasant agriculture in particular have been driven." [12]

If the desirability of a policy of industrialization is granted, it is clear that since industries do not materialize from thin air and are not created by amiable fairy godmothers energy and resources must be diverted from other fields to the creation of industry, at least during the period of its inception and establishment. But the ultimate effect, presumably, is to raise the whole level of the economy; perhaps the agricultural sector will not advance as rapidly or as far, but in the long run at least the whole community should benefit. If Madgearu's conclusion is correct, such was not the result of Rumanian industrialization; instead, the industrial sector pulled away from the rest of the economy, was not directed to satisfying its needs, and may actually have reduced the over-all power of consumption.

Admittedly, twenty-five years may be too brief a period in which to judge such a development. Moreover, as has been mentioned before, a great many external influences had a powerful effect upon the Rumanian economy. The first years after 1921 were spent in recover-

[113]

10. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 204. In this connection see also Joso Tomasevich's chapter on "Foreign Economic Relations," in *Yugoslavia*, ed. Robert J. Kerner (Berkeley; Los Angeles, 1949), which expresses substantially the same view regarding the role of foreign investment in Yugoslavia.

11. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

12. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 258. Madgearu's conclusions, however, are not altogether disinterested. As an old National Peasant who had attacked the protectionist policy of the Liberal party and had lowered tariffs when he was Minister of Finance, he was always of the opinion that industrial development in Rumania had been artificially forced and was battening on the peasant.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

ing from the very extensive devastations of the war; the agrarian crisis and the world depression hurt agriculture all over the world; the agricultural protectionism of the European industrial states drove the east European nations toward industrial protection; from the middle of the 1930's the increasing menace of war led to a growing demand for heavy industries to supply armaments.

But despite all these external influences, there is still reason to believe that the relation of Rumanian agriculture to industry worked to the disadvantage of the former. Politically, of course, there is abundant evidence that industry was a far more promising source of funds than agriculture, and undoubtedly political and private interests worked to the benefit of industry. In 1927, G. D. Creangă observed, "The situation which before the war existed on the land, where a number of latifundiary owners retained the greater part of the agricultural revenue has now passed into the domain of trade and industry." [13] No doubt Rumania's need for industrialization was often used to camouflage private financial motives; in 1932 an English observer maintained that the high protectionist policy was not really designed to protect Rumania from the ravages of foreign capital but had been introduced "mainly because the Brătianu party aimed at reserving for themselves the monopoly of such profits as could be made through the exploitation of the national resources." [14]

In Rumania one can never be sure that such aims are not dominant. Nevertheless, the tension between industry and agriculture certainly involves more than the personal scramble for wealth and profits. The impulse toward industry was also intimately connected with Rumania's foreign commercial relations.

Commerce

Economic tensions on two levels have already been observed: between the peasant and the estate owner in the countryside, especially before 1914, and between agriculture and industry. Both were in some measure a consequence of Rumania's increasing involvement in the complex of world industry and commerce. It is now necessary to examine these external relations.

Rumanian foreign commerce was on a relatively small scale; in 1929, for example, the total value of imports and exports per capita was only one-tenth as great as that for Great Britain in the same

13. Quoted in Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania*, p. 573.
14. George Clinton Logio, *Rumania, Its History, Politics, and Economics* (Manchester, 1932), p. 126.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

439 the distribution of industry were determined by a number of historical contingencies and are not an accurate reflection of the allocation of natural resources.[16] In the second place, historical evidence seems to indicate that the international division of labor has not, in fact, been successful in providing the more backward countries with manufactured goods. "Non-industrial countries can profit from such division of labor only to the extent they enjoy a surplus of their production that can be exported in exchange for foreign manufactures. Figures analyzed . . . clearly indicate that in the majority of non-industrial countries this surplus is not large enough to ensure them a plentiful supply of manufactures." [17] In the third place, regardless of the original reasons for a country's backwardness, the mere fact of backwardness in a competitive international system can serve to impede the country's advance toward industrialization.[18]

In addition to these general disadvantages which face undeveloped agrarian countries in world commerce, certain specific factors during the interwar years damaged Rumania's position as an exporter of agricultural products. The overseas cereal exporters, with their vast extent of land and mechanized agriculture, could produce grain more cheaply than Rumania with its peasant husbandry. The agricultural protectionism of the European industrial states had a very serious effect upon Rumania and all the eastern European states. Finally, the world agrarian depression after 1929 greatly reduced the value of Rumanian exports and created a price scissors.[19]

[113]

16. For a defense of the industrialization of agrarian states as a means of achieving a closer correspondence between the distribution of industry and the allocation of natural resources, see S. N. Prokopovics, *L'Industrialisation des pays agricoles et la structure de l'économie mondiale après la guerre* (Neuchâtel, 1946).

17. League of Nations, *Industrialization and Foreign Trade*, p. 34.

18. K. Mandelbaum, *The Industrialisation of Backward Areas* (Oxford, 1945), p. 4.

19. Royal Institute of International Affairs, *The Balkan States: I. Economic* (Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 65:

Price per Metric Ton of Rumanian Imports and Exports
(in Swiss francs)

	Exports	*Imports*
1922–30	121.3	815.8
1931	68.5	853.9
1932	57.0	823.4
1933	49.3	768.5
1934	46.5	629.6
1935	49.4	547.0
Percentage fall between 1922–30 average and lowest point, 1931–35	62	33

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

434 decade 1925–35). In Mr. Clark's opinion, this represented a drop from a pre-1914 level of 298 international units and set Rumania at the bottom of the eastern European states: [24]

INCOME PER HEAD OF WORKING POPULATION, 1925–34 (IN INTERNATIONAL UNITS)

Rumania	243
Bulgaria	284
Yugoslavia	330
Hungary	359
Poland	352
Czechoslovakia	455
Great Britain	1,069

It is very difficult, however, to make a satisfactory comparison of Rumania's national income before and after the First World War because of the addition of new territories which doubled the area and population and because of the depreciation of the leu. A comparison of the per capita consumption of certain manufactured articles in 1913 and 1927 shows a slight improvement: [25]

ANNUAL PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION IN KILOGRAMS

	1913	1927
Sugar	4.59	5.94
Cotton goods	2.26	2.82
Paper	1.41	2.50
Soap	0.20	0.41

On the other hand, the per capita consumption of cotton goods, which is a fairly good measure of the purchasing power of the peasant, showed no steady advance over the last sixty years. Local consumption of cereals, especially of wheat, increased after the agrarian reforms, although at the expense of exports. Peasant housing appears to have improved through the introduction of better building ma-

[113]

24. Colin Clark, *The Conditions of Economic Progress* (London, 1940), pp. 40, 132. The method used to reach this conclusion was, by necessity, quite complicated. The pre-1914 national income estimate for the Old Kingdom was taken from Dresdener Bank figures; estimates for Bucovina and Transylvania were taken from studies on Austria-Hungary by Walzner and Fellner. The figure for Bessarabia was established arbitrarily. In addition to the task of combining these three estimates, it was necessary to take into account the enormous depreciation of the leu from its pre-1914 level and the change in the level of prices. Given the ultimate uncertainty of Rumanian statistics, it seems impossible to judge the probable accuracy of Mr. Clark's estimate.

25. Madgearu, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

434 terials and wooden floors, and it is quite possible that there were other improvements in village conditions which would not appear in statistics.

The depression greatly reduced the Rumanian income, and by 1937 the per capita real income had not yet regained the 1927 level.

[165] In the chapter on population it was seen that Rumania had an extremely high death rate. This was matched by an extraordinarily high infant mortality rate, the highest in Europe. Between 1931 and 1938 infant deaths showed no sign of declining, but ranged between a maximum of 19.2 per 100 living births in 1935 and a minimum of 17.4 in 1933.

511 The low standard of living implicit in the vital statistics is also reflected in the dietary deficiencies of the Rumanian peasant. A number of surveys taken in the 1930's reached the same general conclusions:[26] while the caloric content of the diet was usually adequate, its quality was very poor; an excessive consumption of grains, especially maize in the form of corn meal (*mămăligă*) and not enough animal products or protective foods. Seasonal consumption, as might be expected, varied widely. The prevalence of pellagra has been an obvious indication of an unbalanced diet.

511 Statistics on housing, disease, medical service, education, and illiteracy confirm the impression that the Rumanian peasant had one of the lowest standards of living in Europe. Admittedly, the statistically average Rumanian is an abstraction. Peasants with holdings over 5 hectares lived better and were healthier than peasants on dwarf holdings. The husbandman with an intensively cultivated farm in Ţara Bârsei in Transylvania had about three times the income of the small holder in Dobrogea. Nevertheless, the flat picture of widespread poverty and squalor presented by the statistics is not far from the truth. The colorful costumes and picturesque folk dances of the Rumanian peasantry should not obscure the fact that in 1930 nearly half the population was illiterate and in 1938 one child in five died before it was a year old.

Accompanying this peasant poverty was a marked inequality in the distribution of the total income. Rumanian statistics do not permit an exact estimate of its extent, but it was perfectly obvious to anyone who visited Bucarest. The unmistakable signs of luxury spending

26. D. C. Georgescu, *L'Alimentation de la population rurale en Roumanie* (Bucarest, 1940); W. Aykroyd, I. Alexa, I. Nitulescu, "Étude de l'alimentation des paysans dans la région à pellagre de Moldavie," *Archives roumaines de pathologie expérimentale et de microbiologie* (Paris, 1935); Ioan Claudian, *Alimentaţia poporului romăn* (Bucarest, 1939).

[113]

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

page 94

VI

THE LIBERAL PERIOD, 1922–28

Survey of Political Events

175
665

RUMANIAN politics did not really "return to normal" until Ion I. C. Brătianu and the National Liberal party took office in January, 1922. The coalition government under Vaida Voevod, which had come in as a result of the first postwar elections in the autumn of 1919, had been arbitrarily ousted by the king in March, 1920,[1] and the war hero General Averescu was called to form a government. Averescu, who had widespread popularity among the troops and was of peasant origin, appears to have played a double role. In 1918 he had formed his People's League as a rallying point against the established corruption and inefficiency of the old parties; he had even engaged in negotiations with the extreme Left.[2] In 1919 he had temporarily joined the Vaida government; on his political campaigns he had promised five hectares of land to every peasant cultivator, a demagogic promise quite impossible of fulfillment. When he came to power, however, as leader of his People's party, it was as the restorer of order, or, as he said, "the last reserve of the Rumanian bourgeoisie."[3]

If the Averescu movement can be said to have had any leading idea at all, it was, as General Cantacuzino put it, that the reforms which were required could not be carried out by the old Liberal party

[113]

1. For the circumstances surrounding the fall of the Vaida government see above, p. 27. According to the Liberals in 1922, the Vaida government collapsed because of a rising bolshevist current: "public opinion demanded General Averescu." *Istoricul Partidului Național Liberal de la 1848 și până astazi* (Bucarest, 1923), p. 226. While there was doubtless a great deal of social unrest at this time, especially since the Socialists had refused to recognize the 1919 elections, there seems to be no reason to doubt that the downfall of the Vaida government was a direct result of collusion between King Ferdinand and the landowners to check Mihalache's proposed agrarian bill.

2. According to the socialist Titel Petrescu (*Socialismul în România*, p. 314), after the armistice Averescu had consulted with the socialists on the prospects of collaboration and had even discussed the possible overthrow of the monarchy.

3. L. Trotsky and Ch. Rakovsky, *Ocherki politicheskoi rumynii* (Moscow, 1922), p. 126. In a debate in the chamber Mihalache inveighed against Averescu's group: "Your party is a heterogeneous conglomeration, without a program, without a clear vision, and without consistency. Your party is based solely on the popularity of General Averescu, and will last only as long as that popularity endures. . . . You are purely and simply covering troops for the old parties of the ruling classes." Mihalache, *Partidul Țărănesc în politica țării* (Bucarest, 1925), pp. 17–18.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

664 manian senate on December 9, 1920, which killed several persons and led to a temporary state of siege in Bucarest. This type of violence was less characteristic of Rumanian than of Bulgarian or Serbian political life, but was a foreshadowing of the political degeneracy of the 1930's.

665 175 Having served his purpose as man of the hour, Averescu's position gradually deteriorated in 1921, partly because of blunders in the cabinet but largely because the various groups which had installed him now deserted and turned against him. The Liberals, who had accepted him, withdrew their support and retired from parliament, on the rather disingenuous grounds that the government was not representative and had mishandled the Liberals' land reform. Whatever the occasion, it was apparent that with the passing of the postwar turmoil the Liberals were prepared to resume their traditional leadership. General Averescu resigned on December 17, 1921. Take Ionescu attempted to form a cabinet but failed to obtain a vote of confidence. On January 19, Ion I. C. Brătianu took over the government.

With the exception of an interlude between March, 1926, and June, 1927, the Liberals were in office from 1922 to 1928. They retained a hold on the key administrative and financial posts and exerted a decisive influence over King Ferdinand in his last years. Perhaps their strongest bulwark was the dominating personality of Ion I. C. Brătianu. This masterful old politician, who had fought stubbornly throughout the war and the peace negotiations for the realization of Greater Rumania, ruled his party and the country in an arbitrary patrician manner, and until his death the Liberals were firmly established.

On the other hand, there is little evidence that they commanded extensive popular support during these years, practically none outside the Old Kingdom. Part of their success lay in the failure of the other parties to create or maintain a united and effective opposition. Although the Liberals did resort to crude electoral manipulations and to repressive police measures, usually in connection with periodic Communist scares, they were still an old-fashioned party and had not developed these procedures to the unhappy perfection now so familiar.[7] Under sufficient pressure they preferred to retire rather than to overthrow the constitution. But it required several years for the National party of Transylvania and the Peasant party of the Old Kingdom to form the consolidated opposition which ultimately dislodged them.

[113]

7. A somewhat sensational glimpse of the dark side of the Liberal administration is given in C. G. Costa-Foru's *Aus den Folterkammern Rumäniens* (Vienna, 1925), an exposé of the terrorist methods employed by the Rumanian secret police, the *Siguranja*.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

thereafter they drifted apart again.[13] In January, 1925, the National party of Transylvania temporarily fused with the historian Iorga's National Democratic party (to which Argetoianu now belonged). In May, 1925, a United Opposition, including Iorga's group, Maniu's Transylvanians, and the Peasant party, was temporarily established and demanded the resignation of the government. Averescu did not join the opposition bloc and it was rumored that he had a secret understanding with the Liberals to succeed them. In elections to the newly created Chambers of Agriculture,[14] 44 out of 75 districts were won by the United Opposition, 27 by the government, and 4 by the People's party. The tide seemed to be turning against the Liberals.

One reason the Liberals were able to maintain their position in the face of a growing if uncoordinated opposition during the years from 1922 to 1925 was the perennial fear of bolshevism, which in turn served to weaken or discredit all radical or reformist movements. On the international level Soviet-Rumanian relations were very bad because of the unresolved Bessarabian dispute. A conference held in Vienna in April, 1924, failed to bring any agreement between the two disputants.[15] Each side accused the other of plotting aggression and each took measures which aggravated the tension. The creation in 1924 of a Moldavian Soviet Republic on the left bank of the Dniester and ominous Soviet speeches forecasting the ultimate reunion of all Moldavians increased Rumanian anxiety. At the same time, in February, 1925, Vintilă Brătianu, Minister of Finance and brother of Ion I. C. Brătianu, stated his opposition to returning Wrangel's fleet to the U.S.S.R. because of the danger of a strong Soviet Black Sea fleet, and announced that negotiations were in progress for the cooperation of British, French, and Rumanian capital in the establishment of an armaments and munitions factory in Rumania.[16] Such an announcement obviously matched the Soviet thesis that the Western bourgeois powers were using the eastern European states as advanced bases for an assault upon the U.S.S.R.

13. For a discussion of the union of the Transylvanian National party and the Peasant party see below, pp. 140–141.

14. Chambers of agriculture were established in each district in 1925, with a mixed membership of elected and appointed members. In addition to their agricultural functions, they elected members to the senate. They soon became political instruments and were of very little value in the improvement of agriculture.

15. According to Louis Fischer, on the basis of information obtained from Christian Rakovsky, Litvinov and Trotsky were willing to accept the loss of Bessarabia, but Stalin, Rakovsky, and Chicherin were not. The latter hoped that by means of the Bessarabian issue they could "keep Rumania perennially on tenterhooks." Louis Fischer, *Men and Politics* (New York, 1941), pp. 134–135.

16. *Times* (London), February 7, 1925.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

a majority of the seats going to the Liberals. The Liberals resigned from the Ştirbey cabinet on June 21, stating that it had failed in its mission.

On June 22 the king called Brătianu, who formed an all-Liberal government, with the addition of Dr. Lupu, Argetoianu, and Titulescu, and issued a manifesto: [22]

> The mission of the Government headed by M. Barbu Ştirbey to achieve an understanding and collaboration between the various political parties has not succeeded, and because of the differences of views in the midst of the cabinet, the electoral campaign threatened to become the occasion of agitation favoring political passions and subversive currents. In these conditions, a government was required which could be upheld by a solidly organized and experienced party and could assume entire responsibility for the situation. His Majesty the King has entrusted us with this heavy responsibility. We desire the sincere application of the laws guaranteeing the liberty of elections. We will not permit the disturbance of order nor the violation of law, and will not tolerate anarchist tendencies. Closely united with our collaborators in the parties which assure us their co-operation we will carry out our program which the country knows well.

This manifesto is a nice epitome of the Liberals' politics. Presenting themselves as the solid defenders of the law and the constitution, they had actually achieved, with the cooperation of the king, a very neat coup. By breaking the Ştirbey coalition and relying on the king's mistrust of the opposition, Brătianu had driven the National Peasants back into the wilderness without the slightest popular justification. The references to "subversive currents" and "anarchist tendencies," while conjuring up the specter of communism, cannot be taken very seriously unless the whole mass of the peasantry was to be considered subversive. It is not surprising that the National Peasants should have seen all the complicated political maneuvers of those years, including the schisms in their own ranks, as Brătianu machinations.

The Liberals dropped their talk of a national cabinet, and conducted the elections of July 7, 1927, in the usual manner; they won 298 out of 387 seats in the chamber; Dr. Lupu was rewarded for his cooperation with 22 seats. The National Peasants managed to obtain 49; Averescu's People's party and Iorga's group failed to obtain even the minimum of 2 per cent of the votes. The political picture

22. *L'Économiste roumain* (Organ de l'Institut Économique Roumain et de l'Association des Banques Roumaines) (July 1, 1927), p. 171.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

665 A more realistic defense of the role of the Liberal party as the leading exponent of the Rumanian bourgeoisie was provided by Stefan Zeletin.[31] Zeletin, however, did not approach the subject from the point of view of liberal principles but employed a quasi-Marxian analysis, though for purposes that were certainly not Marx's. He contended that Rumania was actually in the process of duplicating the course of capitalist development which had taken place in the western European states a century or more earlier. In his view capitalism passed through three stages, each with its own political and social system:

a) commercial capitalism—mercantilism
b) industrial capitalism—liberalism
c) finance capitalism—imperialism.

Rumania was now in the mercantilist phase, which implied energetic state intervention in the economic life of the nation.[32] High protectionist tariffs were justified as proper mercantilist measures, as was the fight against foreign capital.

The leading force in Rumania's economic development, according to Zeletin, had been the smaller boyars who, in the nineteenth century, had entered commerce and finance and by the twentieth century had become a real bourgeois class. He identified the history of the Rumanian bourgeoisie with the history of the Liberal party, which was and remained the "classical party of liberalism." As for the unhappy condition of the peasants, Zeletin held that a period of peasant misery was to be expected as a necessary phase in the transition to capitalism; just as the expansion of the British economy at an earlier date had been accompanied by enclosures and the destruction of the yeomanry, so the backward mass of the Rumanian peasantry had to suffer in the rise of Rumanian capitalism. The peasant was destined to play a secondary role in social movements and none at all in politics. In short, Zeletin was a stout defender of the Rumanian bourgeoisie, whose standard-bearer was the Liberal party, as an indispensable and inevitable element not only of past but of future progress. He condemned the Socialists on the grounds that since Rumanian capitalism was still in the process of formation and had

● [113]

31. Zeletin's two most important studies, which led to lively controversies in the 1920's, were *Burghezia română, origina şi rolul ei istoric* (Bucarest, 1925), and *Neoliberalismul* (Bucarest, 1927). An extensive criticism was made by the Social Democrat Şerban Voinea in *Marxism oligarhic* (Bucarest, 1926). A brief appraisal of Zeletin along with other Rumanian political and economic writers is given in Ion Veverca's review article, "L'Évolution économique de la Roumanie, *Archives pour la science et la réforme sociales, 16*, Nos. 1–4 (Bucarest, 1943), 332–337.

32. Zeletin, *Burghezia română*, p. 19.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

665 firm the supposition that the principles of the Peasant party itself were unstable. The evolution traced here was to be carried even farther when the National Peasants came to power in 1928.

Economic and Agrarian Policy

● [113] A fair illustration of the economic interests of the National Peasant government is to be found in Virgil Madgearu's little book, *Rumania's New Economic Policy*, published in 1930. Of the 63 pages of text, 14 are devoted to agriculture, 22 to the exploitation of state enterprises and the reform of the mining law, ten to foreign trade policy, and eleven to the improvement of transport. The fact that the booklet was published in England and designed for foreign readers merely underlines the preoccupation with affairs other than agricultural. As has been seen, this broadening of interests was the result of the pressing demands of financial, monetary, and commercial matters in 1928–30, but also of the internal trend away from a purely agrarian outlook.

665 241 The most striking feature of the agrarian policy of the National Peasant government was the things it neglected to do or even to consider doing. While the party's attitude toward further redistribution of land had become increasingly moderate, nevertheless in 1926 the program of the united party called for expropriation of properties over 100 hectares. Not a step was taken toward carrying out this measure. To be sure, many reasons militated against such a move. Agriculture was still in the process of readjustment from the previous reforms. Expropriation would undoubtedly have caused a political furor since the mere passage of time was serving to consolidate the previous reform, with all its shortcomings and abuses. Moreover, since the 1917 act was entered in the constitution, it could be modified only by a constitutional amendment, which was forbidden under a regency. Quite obviously, however, the National Peasant party by 1928 was not the radical agrarian movement which had attempted to introduce the reform bill under the Vaida government of 1920.

A second omission was the failure to take any active steps toward the consolidation of peasant strips, a measure which was virtually a precondition for any effective improvement of agriculture. Again, this would have been unsettling and peasant support for this particular reform was by no means certain.

665 241 671 The only serious measure taken in connection with agricultural property relations was an act passed in 1929 which amended the Liberals' law of 1925 concerning the alienation of allotments obtained

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

through the agrarian reforms.[45] The new law, which was designed to facilitate the transfer of land and to further a "process of selection among the peasant cultivators," abolished certain of the restrictions and delays imposed by the Liberals and greatly simplified the procedure of sale, although maintaining safeguards to keep land in the hands of actual cultivators and limiting purchases to Rumanian citizens having not over 25 hectares of land.

The idea that a "process of selection" would enable peasants with "superior competitive efficiency" to create prosperous holdings has had considerable popularity not only in Rumania but in other eastern European states.[46] For such a process to have beneficial consequences, however, it is necessary, first, that superior efficiency on tiny holdings will actually result in sufficient capital accumulation to buy out less efficient peasants, and, second, that the peasants displaced in the process have some alternative means of employment. Otherwise the poorer peasants would be reduced to a landless proletariat and the land taken over by the wealthier peasants. Such seems to have been the effect of the National Peasants' law, although it was not the sole cause; the survey of sixty Rumanian villages made in 1938 reported that the law of 1929 had intensified the differentiation in the peasantry by building up the category of middle peasants on the one hand and of increasing the agricultural proletariat on the other.[47] It was this law perhaps more than any other single act which gave

45. See above, p. 125.

46. Wilbert E. Moore, *Economic Demography of Eastern and Southern Europe*, p. 105, cites a Greek author (C. Evelpedis, *La Réforme agraire en Grèce*, Athens, 1926), as an advocate of this view. In Rumania the alienation of peasant property has had a tangled political history in which at one time or another almost all political parties have reversed their positions. Up to the 1918–21 reforms, official policy tended toward inalienability, whereas the older reformers, such as Dobrogeanu-Gherea and Garofiid, demanded alienation as a necessary step to creating an independent peasantry. The Liberals in 1911 came out for a "process of selection," but in 1925 they restricted the transfer of land. The Peasant party, on the contrary, in 1921 was for government control of all sales, whereas in 1929 it moved toward freer purchase. The Communists, it may be added, roundly condemned the National Peasants for their 1929 law, but Lenin, in his agrarian writings before the Russian revolution, was strongly for alienation. The Communist position is seen in Pătrăşcanu's interpretation of the 1929 law: "From the point of view of opening a way for capitalism in the villages and of differentiation within the rural strata, the measure represented an advance in comparison with the past. But what was the cost of this progress? The land of the poorest and economically most feeble layers of the peasants quickly became the principal object, the prey on which urban banking capital and the village bourgeoisie threw themselves." Lucreţiu Pătrăşcanu, *Sous trois dictatures* (Paris, 1946), p. 106.

47. *60 Sate romînești*, II, 6. The depression doubtless intensified this effect. During the 1946 famine in Moldavia the same thing occurred: peasants who had obtained land under the 1945 reform began to sell to the larger peasants at such a rate that the government was obliged to pass a law nullifying these sales.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

135 The government seeks to facilitate the forming of middle-sized estates of about 10 hectares in area, making them indivisible so that there can be no relapse into sub-dividing. The State has taken to itself the right of acquiring any land which is for sale. It gives preference in its purchase and distribution of land to farms adjoining it, in order that small properties may be enlarged and concentration attained even through private purchase.[8]

The execution of this policy was assigned to BINAG. If property purchased through BINAG could not be sold as a whole within two years, it could be sold in lots of not less than 15 hectares. Sales could be only to Rumanian subjects who undertook to cultivate the land themselves. Such properties could not be broken up and had to be transferred in their entirety. Moreover, such estates could be inherited only as a whole by a single heir. To some extent this law is similar to the German *Erbhofgesetz* of 1933, although it was not as restrictive since it did permit the sale of the land.[9] The aims of this measure were reasonable enough but it was of little use to the small peasant and certainly showed greater interest in the medium holder.

Along with the emphasis upon larger holdings was a rather superficial government paternalism for the peasant. Some of the activities were of value. The studies of village life continued and in several instances produced extremely useful collections of information for an understanding of the agrarian question. The emphasis upon a sociological interpretation of Rumanian peasant life was beneficial in focusing attention upon the realities in Rumania and getting away from the application of quite unsuitable Western political and economic concepts to the local situation. From the scholarly point of view this was all to the good. As a political phenomenon it had a certain danger. Looking at one's fellow countrymen as objects for sociological investigation does not overcome the social chasm between the rulers and the ruled, but may merely put it on a more enlightened basis. It is certainly preferable to dismissing the peasants as "animals who can speak," [10] but it still regards the peasant as object rather than subject.

Other manifestations of Carol's paternalism were of value only in providing employment for his publicity agents. The shabby quality of

[113]

8. *Ibid.*, p. 848.

9. For a discussion of the problem of succession to agricultural property and of recent European legislation in this regard, see M. Tcherkinsky, "The Evolution of the System of Succession to Landed Property in Europe," *International Review of Agriculture, 32*, No. 6 (June, 1941), 165E–196E.

10. I heard this definition defended in dead earnest by a landowner in Bucarest in the winter of 1944.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

● 113 *the Peasant in Rumania* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930), pp. 241–242.

COMMENT: Unfortunately this table and Table VIII, on the distribution of properties, appear to defy comparison, and in certain important respects they are in serious contradiction. The total area for properties is some 2,000,000 hectares larger than that for farms. Probably a large part of this difference is attributable to grazing lands and fallow, which are not included in the statistics for farms. According to figures for 1905, pasture and fallow amounted to about 1,400,000 hectares. L. Colescu, *Progresele economice ale Romăniei indeplinite sub domnia M.S. Regelui Carol I, 1866–1906* (Bucarest, 1907), p. 51. Owner-cultivated farms under 100 hectares are given as some 1,300,000 hectares less than properties under 100 hectares (2,727,000 hectares as against 4,016,000 hectares). It seems impossible to explain this difference either by the absence of grazing land, which belonged mainly to large properties, or by mutual interleasing among peasants, which could scarcely have achieved such a magnitude. The figure for farms over 100 hectares is some 2,100,000 hectares less than that for properties over 100 hectares (1,681,000 hectares as against 3,810,000 hectares). This difference is to be explained by the absence of grazing land in the farm statistics, by the fact that land was leased from the large estates to peasant farms, and by the sale of estate land between 1907 and 1913, but the relative importance of these factors is not clear. The total area leased from properties over 100 hectares is given by Creangă at about 2,300,000 hectares; the total farm area under tenant cultivation, for both large and small farms, is about 2,336,000 hectares, but this similarity is misleading because the figure for leased properties presumably includes grazing land.

The only point in mentioning these inconsistencies—especially in statistics which are known to be of uncertain reliability—is that repeated attempts have been made to reach too definite conclusions through a collation of these tables or a selected part thereof.

31 TABLE XI. PRE-1914 DISTRIBUTION OF LAND IN BESSARABIA

A. By Type of Property

Categories		Number of Properties	Total Area (hectares)	Average Area (hectares)	Per Cent of Total Area
1. Private individual properties	Nobles	1,474	818,744	555.4	20.1
	Priests	126	4,308	34.2	0.1
	Merchants, etc.	1,944	253,867	—	6.7
	Peasants	7,718	135,284	17.5	3.2
	Foreigners	13	30,890	2,337.6	0.8
	Various	10,102	94,157	9.0	2.3
	Large owners	275	169,416	616.3	4.3
		21,652	1,506,266	69.4	36.9
2. Joint holdings		540	201,591	373.3	4.9
3. Nadyel lands		2,209	2,111,940	956.0	50.7
4. State domains		—	53,648	—	1.3
5. Churches and monasteries		—	204,190	—	5.0
6. Town properties		—	23,600	—	0.6
7. Private institutions		—	30,362	—	0.7
		24,401	4,131,597	166.3	100.0

SOURCE: E. Giurgea in *Bulletinul Statistic*, No. 2 (1919), pp. 824–827, quoted in Mitrany, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

This note is not an exhaustive bibliography but includes only those sources employed or consulted in the preparation of this study. A useful bibliography of material on Rumania has been prepared by the Division of Bibliography, Library of Congress: *The Balkans, a Selected List of References: I. General* and *IV. Rumania* (mimeographed, Washington, D.C., 1943). Other extensive bibliographies are Leon Savadjian, *Bibliographie balkanique, 1920–1938* (2 vols., Paris, 1931–39), and Mario Ruffini, "Introduzione bibliografica allo studio della Romania," *L'Europa orientale* (Rome) *15* (May–June, 1935), 236–289. Paul Henry has written two historiographical articles which include discussions of post-1918 works: "Histoire roumaine," *Revue historique* (Paris), *176* (July–December, 1935), 486–537, and "Histoire de Roumanie," *ibid., 194* (1944), 42–65, 132–150, 233–252.

Works which have been used extensively or which have a special interest are discussed briefly. Other sources—technical aids, general studies, and minor Rumanian works—are listed without comment at the end.

OFFICIAL AND SEMIOFFICIAL SOURCES

Most of the statistical information in this study has been obtained from the publications of the Rumanian Central Institute of Statistics (Institutul Central de Statistică), which has issued a variety of censuses, periodical reports, and special studies. Among the more important are:

Censuses:

Recensământul general al populației României din 29 decemvrie 1930 (10 vols., Bucarest, 1938).

Recensământul general al României din 1941, 6 aprilie, date sumare provizorii (Bucarest, 1944). A collection of articles on the national significance of the 1941 census was published as *Recensământul României din 1941, lamurirea opiniei publice* (Bucarest, 1941).

Roman Cresin, *Recensământul agricol al României din 1941, date provizorii*, Biblioteca Statistică No. 10 (Bucarest, 1945).

A. Golopenția and D. C. Georgescu, *Populația Republicii Populare Române la 25 ianuarie 1948, rezultatele provizorii ale recensământului* (Bucarest, 1948).

A. Golopenția and P. Onica, *Recensământul agricol din Republica Populară Română, 25 ianuarie 1948, rezultate provizorii* (Bucarest, 1948).

Periodical reports:

Anuarul statistic al României. An annual statistical survey; before 1914 it was prepared by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

331

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

● 113 ***Bréviaire statistique de la Roumanie.*** An abbreviated French version of *Anuarul.*

Statistica agricolă a României. An annual statistical survey of the agricultural situation. Included under this title are certain special surveys: Vol. IV, *Inventarul agricol în Anul 1943* (Bucarest, 1946), and Vol. V, *Inventarul agricol în Anul 1945* (Bucarest, 1947).

Comunicări statistice. Since 1945 the institute, to make up for the lapses during the war, has published fortnightly a selection of miscellaneous statistics to be issued later in more detail. Very useful for recent developments.

Analele Institutului Statistic al României. A publication started during the war and containing articles on statistical methods.

Special studies:

Roman Cresin, *Agricultura din Județul Argeș* (Bucarest, 1945). A detailed study of one district, based on the 1941 census. Extremely useful so long as the complete results of the census are not published.

Petre Onica, *Statistica agricolă* (Bucarest, 1945). A guide to the preparation of agricultural statistics in Rumania.

G. Retegan, *Condițiile de viață ale oamenilor de serviciu,* Biblioteca Statistică, No. 21 (Bucarest, 1945). One of the few pieces of precise information about the living conditions of government employees and their reasons for leaving the village to work in the capital.

Nicolae M. Dunăre, *Fii de țărani vânzători ambulanți în capitala,* Biblioteca Statistică, No. 22 (Bucarest, 1945). A survey of street vendors who have emigrated from the villages to Bucarest; touches on the question of agricultural overpopulation.

Sabin Manuila, *Demografia rurală a României* (Bucarest, 1940).

Sabin Manuila, *Studiu etnografic asupră populației României* (Bucarest, 1940).

Sabin Manuila and D. C. Georgescu, *Populația României* (Bucarest, 1938).

Official texts of laws are published in the government gazette, *Monitorul oficial.* The first part is devoted to laws and decrees, the second to legal notices, and the third to parliamentary debates.

The Ministry of Agriculture (Ministerul Agriculturii și Domeniilor) published a monthly *Buletinul agriculturii* (sometimes appearing under the French title, *Bulletin de l'agriculture*), devoted largely to technical studies but including economic and regional surveys. Among these were R. C. Stere, "Particularitățile economice ale micilor gospodării țărănești" (April–June, 1927), pp. 33–64; R. Cresin, "Agricultura in Basarabia" (March–April, 1929), pp. 132–151; Mihai Șerban, "Les Conséquences de la réforme agraire sur l'état social et économique de la Roumanie" (May–June, 1929), pp. 21–27. The ministry also published, on the occasion of the Fourteenth Congress of the International Congress of Agriculture in Bucarest (June 7–10, 1929), *L'Agriculture en Roumanie: atlas statistique* (Bucarest, 1929), which is filled with

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

charts and diagrams; the accuracy of some of the information is doubtful however. At the same conference A. Nasta presented a paper, "La Réforme agraire en Roumanie," which contained the official though not very reliable statistics on the application of the 1918–21 agrarian reforms. 113

The Ministry of Industry and Commerce (Ministerul Industriei şi Comerţului) published a quarterly periodical in French and English, *Correspondance économique roumaine*, containing articles on Rumanian economic life, texts of laws, and summaries of the economic situation. Designed to present Rumania in the best possible light, it suffered from chronic overoptimism.

The Ministry of Finance (Ministerul Finanţelor) published an annual *Expunere de motive la bugetul general al statului*, which in addition to information on the budget contained a summary of economic developments.

The Rumanian National Bank (Banca Naţională) published a monthly *Bulletin d'information et de documentation*, containing financial and economic studies. A somewhat similar publication was the semiofficial *L'Économiste roumain* (*Organ de l'Institut Économique Roumain et de l'Association des Banques Roumaines*), which discussed most of the economic laws and agreements of the Liberal regime. In economic policy it followed Vintilă Brătianu.

The semiofficial *Enciclopedia României* (4 vols., Bucarest, n.d.) was started as a monument to the Carol regime but was completed under Marshal Antonescu. It contains many articles, some of them excellent, on all aspects of Rumanian life. The last two volumes are devoted to economic and commercial affairs. As a whole, however, it reflects the political bias of the years of the Carol and Antonescu dictatorships and strives to gloss over the unpleasant parts of the political and economic scene.

Since the advent of the Groza government, its propaganda ministry has issued a number of publications, of rather low quality, on economic developments. *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie* (Bucarest, November, 1946) contains the text of the 1945 agrarian reform, but the commentary is worthless. The periodical *Rumanian Review* (French edition, *Revue roumaine*) has a number of articles on economic and political life, but they are all tainted with propagandist aims. Of somewhat greater value, though also containing a good deal of propaganda, is a series of pamphlets put out by Oficiul de Studii şi Documentare, Biblioteca Economică: *Îmbunătăţirile funciare în agricultura românească* (Bucarest, 1946); Cornel Irimie, *Centrele de maşini agricole* (Bucarest, 1946); *Intensificarea creşterii animalelor în cadrul refacerii economice* (Bucarest, 1946); Traian Săvulescu, *Problema alimentării populaţiei* (Bucarest, 1947). The last work has some useful data on the severe famine of the winter of 1946–47.

An extremely valuable source of information is the work carried on by the semiofficial Institutul de Ştiinţe Sociale al României, under the direction of the sociologist D. Gusti; *60 Sate româneşti* (5 vols., Bucarest, 1941–43) presents the results of a sampling investigation in a number of Rumanian villages in the summer of 1938. It is especially useful for its data on peasant agriculture, land relations, and the standard of living in the countryside. Detailed studies have been made of certain villages selected as representative of

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

113 a particular aspect of Rumanian peasant society. *Nerej, un village d'une région archaïque* (3 vols., Bucarest, 1939) investigates a community in a region of traditionally free peasants. *Dâmbovnicul, o plasă din sudul Județului Argeș* (Bucarest, 1942) was chosen as a representative Wallachian peasant community under the impact of modern economic pressures. A more general study of the forms of village landholding was prepared by H. H. Stahl, *Sociologia satului devălmaș românesc* (Bucarest, 1946). The institute also published two periodicals which have articles on a wide range of social, political, and economic topics: *Arhiva pentru știința si reforma socială* (occasionally issued in French as *Archives pour la science et la réforme sociales*) and *Sociologie românească.*

GENERAL HISTORIES

There is, in English, only one extensive history of Rumania from its origins: R. W. Seton-Watson, *A History of the Roumanians from the Roman Times to the Completion of Unity* (Cambridge University Press, 1934). It does not extend to the period covered in the present study but gives a useful outline of Rumania's activities in the First World War and the acquisition of the new territories. The two most extensive histories of Rumania in Rumanian are Constantin C. Giurescu, *Istoria Românilor* (4 vols., Bucarest, 1935–37) and Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria Românilor* (10 vols., Bucarest, 1936–39). (For a recent appraisal of Iorga's work as a historian see John C. Campbell, "Nicholas Iorga," *The Slavonic and East European Review, 26,* No. 66 [November, 1947], 44–59.) Neither of these works, however, treats the interwar period.

Although he is primarily concerned with the agrarian reforms of 1918–21, David Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania: the War and Agrarian Reform (1917–1921)*, Economic and Social History of the World War, Rumanian Series, published for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History (London; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930), provides much the best background to the agrarian question. It studies the period of reform in the greatest detail and analyses the consequences of the reforms up to the fall of the Brătianu government. Prepared in the 1920's, this book expressed optimistic hopes regarding the future of the peasant movement in eastern Europe which have not been realised. In some cases the wealth of statistical material leads to confusion rather than clarity, but in its general sweep it is a very impressive study. Of much less importance are two other books in the Carnegie war history series: G. Ionescu-Sișești, *L'Agriculture de la Roumanie pendant la guerre,* and Gr. Antipa, *L'Occupation ennemie de la Roumanie et ses conséquences économiques et sociales* (Paris; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1929).

There are no satisfactory histories of Rumania in the interwar period. Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems: a Study in Modern Nationalism* (Stanford University Press, 1932), attempts a general survey up to 1931, but it is largely a chronicle and a compendium; analysis is very weak. Roucek also devoted a chapter to Rumania in his later study, *The*

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

Politics of the Balkans (London; New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939), but a far more adequate treatment of Rumania in the general setting of eastern Europe is given by Hugh Seton-Watson, *Eastern Europe between the Wars, 1918–1941* (2d ed., Cambridge University Press, 1946), a work of great insight and originality. George Clinton Logio, *Rumania, Its History, Politics, and Economics* (Manchester, Sherratt and Hughes, 1932), is a very uneven book but is useful where it reflects Logio's own experiences in Rumania. Charles Upson Clark, *United Roumania* (New York, Dodd, Mead, 1932), is an enlargement of the earlier study, *Greater Roumania* (New York, Dodd, Mead, 1922), but neither work is outstanding. C. G. Rommenhöller, *Gross-Rumänien, seine ökonomische, soziale, finanzielle, und politische Struktur, speziell seine Reichtümer* (Berlin, Puttkammer und Mühlbrecht, 1926), is mainly concerned with Rumania's industrial potentialities; the political and historical sections are very brief. Norman L. Forter and Demeter B. Rostovsky, *The Roumanian Handbook* (London, Simpkin, Marshall, 1931) is a loosely organized collection of information on Rumania. Pavel Pavel, *Why Rumania Failed* (London, Alliance Press, n.d.) is an anti-Carol, pro-Maniu apology for Rumania's participation in the Second World War; it is factually unreliable. Convenient as a brief handbook is C. Kormos, *Rumania*, British Survey Handbooks (Cambridge University Press, 1944).

REGIONAL STUDIES

The Royal Institute of International Affairs prepared a number of Balkan studies, with a special emphasis on economic questions, which include some useful information on Rumania: *The Balkan States. I. Economic* (Oxford University Press, 1936); *South-Eastern Europe, a Political and Economic Survey* (Oxford University Press, 1939); and *South-Eastern Europe, a Brief Survey*, Information Department Papers, No. 26 (Oxford University press, 1940). A recent study of post-1945 constitutional developments in this region is Andrew Gyorgy, *Governments of Danubian Europe* (New York, Rinehart, 1949).

A good survey of the economic policy of the Danubian states in the early 1920's is provided by Leo Pasvolsky, *Economic Nationalism of the Danubian States* (New York, Macmillan, 1928). Especially valuable for the 1930's and the period of German economic penetration is Antonin Basch, *The Danube Basin and the German Economic Sphere*, International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction (London, Kegan Paul, 1944). Frederick Hertz, *The Economic Problem of the Danubian States* (London, Victor Gollancz, 1947), is mainly concerned with Austria and Hungary; the material on Rumania is scanty and in some cases inaccurate. The PEP study (Political and Economic Planning), *Economic Development in S. E. Europe* (London, 1945), contains some helpful comparative information on economic conditions but is chiefly interested in future plans. N. Momtchiloff, *Ten Years of Controlled Trade in South-Eastern Europe*, National Institute of Economic and Social Research, Occasional Papers, Vol. VI (Cambridge University Press, 1944),

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

●113 is a brief examination of the trade policy pursued in the 1930's and suggests that certain of the controls developed in those years may have a useful function in the proper context.

A number of League of Nations studies have been of value, above all Wilbert E. Moore, *Economic Demography of Eastern and Southern Europe* (Economic, Financial and Transit Department, League of Nations, Geneva, 1945), which has an excellent analysis of agricultural overpopulation in its relation to the agrarian problem in eastern Europe. Also to be mentioned are *Industrialization and Foreign Trade* (1945); *Agricultural Production in Continental Europe during the 1914–18 War and the Reconstruction Period* (1943); *Final Report of the Mixed Committee of the League of Nations on the Relation of Nutrition to Health, Agriculture, and Economic Policy* (1938), which has a section on the Rumanian peasant diet; *The Agricultural Crisis* (2 vols., 1931); Dudley Kirk, *Europe's Population in the Interwar Years* (1946); *Memorandum on Public Finance, 1926–28* (1929), with a section on Rumania, pp. 203–221; and *The League of Nations Reconstruction Schemes in the Inter-War Period* (1945), Appendix I, "Trade and Production in the Danubian States."

RUMANIAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

The most recent large study is Virgil Madgearu, *Evoluția economiei românești după războiul mondial* (Bucarest, Independența economică, 1940). While the organization of this work is cumbersome, it is the only extensive Rumanian interpretation of the interwar period. It contains a good deal of information which Madgearu obtained from unpublished sources. Its outlook is that of a disappointed and somewhat disillusioned National Peasant. N. Razmirița, *Essai d'économie roumaine moderne, 1831–1931* (Paris, Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1932) is largely devoted to the pre-1914 period; its sections on the postwar years are not very good. Florin Em. Manoliou, *La Réconstruction économique et financière de la Roumanie et les partis politiques* (Paris, J. Gamber, 1931), undertakes to analyze the economic policy of the Liberal, People's party, and National Peasant governments in the years between 1920 and 1931. Not a very penetrating study, it is of value in sketching the principal economic measures of the various cabinets.

Like Razmirița and Manoliou, quite a number of Rumanian students in Paris wrote dissertations on aspects of Rumanian economic life. The quality of these is very uneven; some are worthless, others are quite good. Perhaps the best are Savel Radulescu, *La Politique financière de la Roumanie depuis 1914* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1928), and Nicolas C. Cristoveanu, *Essai critique sur la politique roumaine en matière de dettes agricoles* (Paris, A. Rousseau, 1933). Less useful are C. A. Tatarano, *Les Nouvelles tendances économiques de la Roumanie* (Paris, 1922); Dorin Kastris, *Les Capitaux étrangers dans la finance roumaine* (Paris, 1921); A. Theveneau, *La Roumanie économique et le change roumain au lendemain de la guerre* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires, 1923); Alexandre-Ionescu Ivanof, *La*

3; Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

Réforme monétaire roumaine (Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1929); A. G. Georgescu, *Le Régime juridique et financier des capitaux étrangers en Roumanie* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires, 1932); Ludovic Iavorschi, *L'Équilibre budgétaire en Roumanie de 1920 à 1932* (Paris, J. Gamber, 1933); Mihail-Dumitru N. Israil, *Le Marché monétaire roumain après la stabilisation monétaire* (Paris, Librairie L. Rodstein, 1933).

THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

As has been mentioned, David Mitrany's *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* is the most satisfactory study of the agrarian question. Much briefer and less comprehensive is Ifor L. Evans, *The Agrarian Revolution in Roumania* (Cambridge University Press, 1924). A very informative history of the Rumanian peasant question in the nineteenth century is Marcel Emerit, *Les Paysans roumains depuis le Traité d'Andrinople jusqu'à la libération des terres, 1829–1864* (Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937). It was M. Emerit's intention to write a second volume on the years between the emancipation and the agrarian reform, but it has not yet appeared.

Classic Rumanian studies on the peasant question are the two works of Radu Rosetti, *Pământul, sătenii, și stăpânii in Moldova* (Bucarest, SOCEC, 1907) and *Pentru ce s'au răsculat țăranii* (Bucarest, SOCEC, 1908). Rosetti wrote from a populist point of view, and his belief in the peasants' original right to the land was challenged by his contemporary, Gheorghe Panu, in *O Incercare de mistificare istorică* (Bucarest, Broser and Parser, 1910). It is now generally agreed that a number of Rosetti's conclusions were based on very weak evidence.

Among other studies which date from the time of the 1907 uprising but which are still important for an understanding of the Rumanian agrarian question are those of Garoflid and Creangă. Constantin Garoflid's penetrating analysis, *Chestia agrară in România* (Bucarest, Gutenberg, 1920), was originally written in 1907 but later published with other articles and speeches. A landowner himself, Garoflid criticized the old latifundiary system of cultivation but was opposed to the creation of a multitude of small properties which would not be self-sustaining. Some of his statistics, which have been employed by subsequent authors, are clearly incorrect. His views on the postreform period may be found in two articles: *Un Program agrar* (Bucarest, 1924) and *Rolul social al proprietații mijlocii* (Bucarest, 1926), as well as in a contribution to the *Enciclopedia României*. G. C. Creangă, *Grundbesitzverteilung und Bauernfrage in Rumänien*, 3 Teile, in *Staats- und sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, Hefte 129, 140 (Leipzig, 1907, 1909), is the most complete statistical analysis of Rumanian property relations before the agrarian reforms; Creangă's figures, while not wholly satisfactory, have provided the basis for most estimates of the pre-1914 situation.

The veteran agricultural economist G. Ionescu-Sișești wrote a number of works on the agrarian question. For the most part, however, they are marred by the tone of bland optimism which is the bane of much Rumanian writing

3; Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

of an official or semiofficial nature. *Politica agrară cu privire specială la România* (Bucarest, Libraria L. Alcalay, n.d., ca. 1913) has an interesting review of Rumanian writings on the agrarian question. In *Structure agraire et production agricole de la Roumanie* (Bucarest, 1924) he examined the consequences of the agrarian reforms, especially in their effect upon cultivation in metayage. He collaborated with A. Frundianescu in a contribution to *Agricultural Systems of Middle Europe, a Symposium*, ed. O. S. Morgan (New York, Macmillan, 1933), and with N. Cornăţeanu in *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie et ses conséquences* (Bucarest, Académie roumaine, 1937), which provides some useful farm-accountancy statistics but is quite misleading in its interpretation of Rumanian peasant agriculture. During the Second World War, however, he wrote a very pessimistic study, "Le Nouvel Aspect du problème agraire en Roumanie," *Archives pour la science et la réforme sociales, 16*, Nos. 1–4 (1943), 260–267.

The legal aspects of the 1918–21 agrarian reforms are discussed in Ilie S. Diaconescu, *Chestiunea ţărănească în România* (Bucarest, Cultura Poporului," 1928), which gives the texts of the laws and an extended commentary; its value as a historical narrative is limited. Mitiţa Constantinescu, *L'Evolution de la propriété rurale et la réforme agraire en Roumanie* (Bucarest, 1925), while written at great length and with assurance, was prepared before many of the results of the reforms were known. In 1945 Constantinescu came out as a stanch advocate of intimate Rumanian-Soviet relations (see his pamphlet *Relaţiile economice între România şi U.R.S.S.*, Bucarest, Cartea Rusă, 1945), but in this earlier study he stressed the importance of the agrarian reform as a bulwark against bolshevism.

A number of Paris dissertations were concerned with the agrarian question; none is outstanding: C. C. Bosiano, *La Politique paysanne en Roumanie depuis la guerre* (Paris, 1920); Valeriu Bercaru, *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie* (Paris, H. Gamber, 1928); Antoniu Saki, *La Question agraire en Roumanie* (Paris, Les Presses Modernes, 1926). Of the same order is Ernest Grintzesco, *Le Problème du redressement agricole en Roumanie* (Bucarest, F. Göbl et Fils., 1931).

A good summary of Rumania's agrarian position at the outbreak of the Second World War, especially in regard to its export position, was prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, "Wartime Agricultural Surpluses of the Danube Basin," *Foreign Agriculture, 4*, No. 12 (December 1940), 705–778. The article does, however, attribute too many virtues to the pre-1914 large estates.

A very intelligent analysis of the Rumanian agrarian problem is by the Danish specialist, M. Gormsen, *Short Introduction to the Principal Structural Problems of the Agriculture in Roumania* (Bucarest, 1945). The Rumanian text of this rather bad English translation is to be found in the volume issued by Institutul Economic Românesc, *Problema agrară* (Bucarest, Cartea Românească, 1945) which also includes an article by Valeriu Bulgariu on the subdividing of peasant property, "Divizibilitatea proprietăţii ţărăneşti."

In the last decade or so there have been a number of studies on the plight of

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

the eastern European peasant countries. Doreen Warriner, in *The Economics of Peasant Farming* (Oxford University Press, 1939), came to the negative conclusion that emigration was virtually the only solution to the problem of overpopulation. A more positive solution has been proposed by K. Mandelbaum, *The Industrialisation of Backward Areas*, Oxford Institute of Statistics Monograph, No. 2 (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1945). This study, which is based on the southeastern European states, draws up a formal model for their planned industrialisation. Its principal limitation, as the author admits, is that it abstracts all the political difficulties. Two other works may be mentioned which reflect the same interest: S. N. Prokopovicz, *L'Industrialisation des pays agricoles et la structure de l'économie mondiale après la guerre*, trans. N. Nicolsky (Neuchâtel, 1946), and P. N. Rosenstein-Rodan, "Problems of Industrialisation of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe," *The Economic Journal, 53* (1943), 202–211.

POLITICAL MOVEMENTS

A useful guide for political developments up to 1936 is the publication of the Conférence Permanente des Hautes Études Internationales, *Chronique des événements politiques et économiques dans le bassin danubien, 1918–1936: Roumanie* (Paris, Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle, Société des Nations, 1938). This booklet also lists and summarizes the principal laws and decrees of the period. A symposium of lectures on political theories current in Rumania at the beginning of the interwar period was published by Institutul Social Român as *Doctrinele partidelor politice* (Bucarest, Cultura Națională, n.d.). The book includes lectures on nationalism by Iorga, peasantism by Virgil Madgearu, liberalism by I. G. Duca, conservatism by Al. Marghiloman, neoliberalism by M. Manoilescu, and socialism by Șerban Voinea. No Communist was invited to speak. While one may feel that a number of these lectures had little or nothing to do with Rumanian realities, the collection is most interesting in showing the eagerness with which the Rumanians were attempting to relate their society to the West. A much less interesting work is *Politics and Political Parties in Roumania* (London, International Reference Library Publishing Co., 1936), which includes the programs of the principal parties and a political "Who's Who."

a. *Liberals*

Istoricul Partidului Național Liberal de la 1848 și până astazi (Bucarest, 1923) is a rather conventional official history of the party. It is of little use for the interwar period. A biography of Vintilă Brătianu was written by C. Georgescu, *Vintilă Brătianu ca om de stat, economist și financiar* (Bucarest, 1936). Brătianu's economic views found frequent expression in the abovementioned *L'Économiste roumain;* they were also clearly displayed in a parliamentary address which was translated into French: *La Situation financière de la Roumanie; discours tenu à la Chambre des Députés les 1 et 2 février 1923* (Bucarest, Imprimeria "Indépendance," 1923). Some informa-

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

113 tion on the banking activities of the Liberals is to be found in Alfred Bonafous, "Les Grandes Banques d'affaires de Roumanie," *Revue d'économie politique* (Paris), *36* (1922), 323–340. The darker side of the Liberal regime is seen in the somewhat sensational exposé of the methods employed by the secret police: C. G. Costa-Foru, *Aus den Folterkammern Rumäniens* (Vienna, Kulturpolitischer Verlag, 1925).

The most brilliant defense of the role of the Rumanian Liberal party was made by St. Zeletin, who propounded a highly ingenious though probably untenable theory of Rumania's historical development in his two studies, *Burghezia română, origina şi rolul ei istoric* (Bucarest, Cultura Naţională, 1925) and *Neoliberalismul* (Bucarest, Editura "Pagini agrare şi sociale," 1927). His quasi-Marxist approach was bitterly attacked by the Social Democrat, Şerban Voinea, in *Marxism oligarhic, contribuţie la problema desvoltarii capitaliste a României* (Bucarest, Editura I. Brănişteanu, 1926).

b. *National Peasants*

The best exposition of the principles of Rumanian populism is Constantin Stere's series of articles entitled "Socialdemocratism sau poporanism," *Viaţa românească* (August, 1907–April, 1908). Stere's views, somewhat modified, are also to be found in his pamphlet *Naţionalizarea industriei de petrol* (Bucarest, 1921). The issue between Marxism and populism is also examined in David Mitrany, "Marx vs. the Peasant," *London Essays in Economics: in Honour of Edwin Cannon*, eds. T. E. Gregory and H. Dalton (London, Routledge, 1927). J. Delevsky, "Les Idées des 'narodniki' russes," *Revue d'économie politique, 35* (1921), 432–462, gives a brief history of Russian populism and is a source frequently cited by Rumanian peasantist writers. A biting criticism of Rumanian populism is to be found in the essays of H. Sanielevici, collected as *Poporanismul reacţionar* (Bucarest, SOCEC, 1921). For a recent exposition of populism by a well-known Bulgarian politician see George M. Dimitrov, "Agrarianism," *European Ideologies. A Survey of Twentieth Century Political Ideas*, ed. Felix Gross (New York, Philosophical Library, 1948), pp. 896–451.

The most vivid and intelligent expressions of the radical agrarianism of the early Peasant party are Ion Mihalache's parliamentary speeches, which were published separately as political pamphlets: *Proectul legei de improprietarirea tăranilor, intocmit de ţăranul I. Mihalache* (Bucarest, Tipografia "Lupta," 1920); *Dreptul ţăranilor la pământ, islazuri, şi păduri* (Bucarest, Tipografia Berbecaru, 1922); and *Partidul Ţărănesc în politica ţărei* (Bucarest, 1925).

The move away from populism and toward a form of liberal capitalism is seen in the writings of Virgil Madgearu: *Ţărănismul* (Bucarest, "Reforma Socială," n.d.); "Doctrina Ţărănistă," in *Doctrinele partidelor politice; Revoluţia agrară şi evoluţia clasei ţărăneşti* (Bucarest, 1928); *Agrarianism—un discurs parlamentar* (Bucarest, Imprimeria Statului, 1927): *Rumania's New Economic Policy* (London, P. S. King, 1930); *La Politique économique extérieure de la Roumanie, 1927–1938*, Conférence Permanente des Hautes

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

Études Internationales, xii^e session, Mémoire roumaine, No. 1 (Paris, Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle, Société des Nations, 1939).

An attempt to unite peasantism with a revived conservatism was made by C. Rădulescu-Motru, *Țărănismul, un suflet și o politică* (Bucarest, Cultura Națională, 1924). While one may doubt the feasibility of this attempt, the essay is excellent in its portrayal of all the anomalies in Rumania's political life.

The modifications in the outlook of the Peasant party appear clearly in the successive programs of 1921, 1922, 1924, and 1926: *Proectul de program al Partidului Țărănesc din România* (Bucarest, "Viața românească," 1921); *Partidul Țărănesc, Programul și Statutele* (Bucarest, 1922); *Partidul Țărănesc, Programul general și Statutele* (Bucarest, 1925); and *Partidul Național-Țărănesc, Principiile programul și statutul* (Bucarest "Reforma Socială," 1926).

c. *The Carolist Era*

An "official" biography of King Carol by Baroness Helena von der Hoven, *King Carol of Romania* (London, Hutchinson, 1940), is of practically no value and shows little understanding of Rumanian politics. A more serious study, A. L. Easterman, *King Carol, Hitler, and Lupescu* (London, Gollancz, 1942), recognizes Carol's autocratic and arbitrary instincts but does not give him sufficient credit for his part in wrecking the parliamentary system. Easterman makes Antonescu, the Iron Guard, and the Germans the complete villains of the piece.

The most interesting, if also most exasperating, political economist of this period was Mihail Manoilescu, whose works are listed in Florin E. Manoliou, *Bibliographie des travaux du Professeur Mihail Manoilesco* (Bucarest, "Luceafarul," 1936). The earlier phases of Manoilescu's thought are represented in his article, "Neoliberalismul" in *Doctrinele partidelor politice*, and in his critique of peasantism: *Țărănism și democrație* (Bucarest, 1922). His most important study was translated into English as *The Theory of Protection and International Trade* (London, P. S. King, 1931). An expanded German edition, *Die nationalen Produktivkräfte und der Aussenhandel* (Berlin, 1937), included his rebuttals of the numerous criticisms of his theory of permanent protection.

A series of articles—obviously designed for foreign consumption—on the economic policy of the Carolist dictatorship appeared in several issues of *The Banker* (London): V. Dimitriuc, "Roumanian Exports and Agrarian Policy," *51* (July, 1939), 49–53; Valeriu Bulgariu, "Agrarian Policy in Roumania," *49* (March, 1939), 844–848; Mitița Constantinescu, "The Monetary and Credit Policy of Roumania," *44* (February, 1938), 188–189; C. Angelescu, "Banking Development in Roumania," *ibid.*, pp. 189–192; Eugene Savu, "The Financial Policy of Roumania," *ibid.*, pp. 193–194; G. Ionescu-Sișești, "Agriculture in Roumania," *ibid.*, pp. 197–201; Ch. Penesco-Kertsch, "Industry in Roumania," *ibid.*, pp. 206–209.

The Germans produced a mass of official and semi-official literature in the

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

●113 course of their economic drive in the Balkans. One of the more important examples is Ernst Wagemann, *Der neue Balkan: altes Land—junge Wirtschaft* (Hamburg, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939), a portion of which was translated as "The Pressure of Population as an Economic Force," *Weekly Report of the German Institute for Business Research*, Nos. 25/26 and 27/28 (June 29–July 14, 1939). Wagemann criticised the forced industrialization of the Balkan states and attempted to show that they would do better to develop their raw materials and let Germany provide the manufactured goods.

Although Grigore Gafencu's two books, *Prelude to the Russian Campaign*, trans. E. Fletcher-Allen (London, Frederick Muller, 1945), and *Last Days of Europe. A Diplomatic Journey in 1939*, trans. E. Fletcher-Allen (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1948), are chiefly concerned with diplomatic relations, they do provide some information on the last phase of the Carolist dictatorship. Also dealing with foreign relations before 1939 are two books by another Rumanian foreign minister, N. P. Comnène, *Preludi del grande dramma* (Rome, Edizioni Leonardo, 1947) and *I Responsabili* (Verona, Arnoldo Mondadori, 1949).

d. *The Fascists*

Codreanu's memoirs were published in German as Codreanu, *Eiserne Garde* (Berlin, Brunnen Verlag/Willi Bischoff, 1939). Codreanu's narrative stops at 1938, but the German edition includes some later information provided by members of the Guard. Klaus Charle, *Die Eiserne Garde* (Berlin-Vienna, Deutscher Rechtsverlag, 1939), is an enthusiastically pro-Guardist account of the movement. I. P. Vifor, *Doctrina fascismului român* (Bucarest, 1924), which contains the program of the ephemeral Fascia Națională Română, is of interest as an expression of an early imitation of Italian fascism. For a macabre account of the atrocities committed while the Iron Guardists were in power see "Blood Bath in Rumania," published by *The Record*, 4, Nos. 6–7, (New York, July–August, 1942).

Harald Laeuen, *Marschall Antonescu* (Essener Verlagsanstalt, 1943), provides an admiring biography of Germany's loyal ally. The first volume of an account of Antonescu's career by a former secretary, G. Barbul, *Mémorial Antonesco: Tome Premier, le III^e Homme de l'Axe* (Paris, Editions de la Couronne, 1950), appeared too late to be used in this study.

e. *The Marxists*

Constantin Titel Petrescu's history of Rumanian socialism, *Socialismul în România* (Bucarest, Biblioteca Socialistă, n.d., *ca.* 1945), is valuable for its inclusion of party programs, resolutions, and speeches. It is very uneven in its treatment, however; over three-fourths of the book is devoted to the years before 1919, and the interwar period is covered superficially. Some useful information on the Rumanian socialist movement before the war and in the unsettled months after 1917 is given in L. Trotsky and Ch. Rakovsky, *Ocherki*

3: Roberts 5-4 (no date)1951 EDI Rumania EDI

politicheskoi Rumynii (Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo, 1922). The first half of the book consists of a collection of articles written by Trotsky while in Rumania in 1913; in the second half Rakovsky interprets the political situation of postwar Rumania. An account of the final absorption of Rumanian Social Democracy by the Communists may be found in Valentin Thoma, "Wie es zur Liquidierung des rumänischen Sozialismus kam," *Die Zukunft* (July, 1949).

There is relatively little reliable information on the history of the Rumanian Communist party, largely because the party was illegal during most of its existence. However, in the issues of the organs of the Comintern, *The Communist International* and *International Press Correspondence*, there are occasional directives to the Rumanian Communists as well as comments on their activities.

Some information on conditions in Rumania, though surprisingly little, is in the publications of the Red Peasant International: *Der Weltbund der Bauern: Der Gründung des Internationalen Bauern-Rates* (Berlin, 1924); Dr. Kazescu, "Die rumänische Bauernschaft und der Europäische Bauern-Kongress," *Bulletin zum Europäischen Bauern-Kongress*, No. 4 (Berlin, 1930), pp. 39–48; *Europas werktätige Bauern schreiten zur revolutionären Tat* (Berlin, 1930); N. L. Mecheriakov, *The Peasantry and the Revolution* (Berlin, 1927); Guido Miglioli, *Bauernnot und Hakenkreuz* (Berlin, Verlag des EBK, n.d.).

The International Agrarian Institute in Moscow published a periodical, *Agrarprobleme*, which occasionally had articles on agrarian conditions in the Balkans and in Rumania: B. Boschkowitsch, "Der revolutionäre Aufschwung auf dem Balkan," Band 4, Heft 3–4, (n.d., *ca.* 1931), pp. 151–157; Tatarow, "Die Agrarkrise in Rumänien," Band 4, Heft 2, pp. 44–80; S. Timow, "Wird Rumänien agrarsiert oder industrialisiert?" Band 2, Heft 2 (1929), pp. 310–346.

The outstanding Marxist thinker in Rumania was undoubtedly C. Dobrogeanu-Gherea, whose book *Neviobăgia* (1st ed. 1910, 2d ed., Bucarest, Viața românească, n.d.) is still extremely valuable for an understanding of Rumania. During the Second World War the Communist Luereţiu Pătrăşcanu, until 1948 Minister of Justice in the Groza cabinet, wrote a trilogy of studies on Rumanian history and society: *Un Veac de frământări sociale, 1821–1907* (Bucarest, Cartea Rusă, 1945); *Problemele de bază ale României* (3rd ed., Bucarest, Editura de Stat, 1946); and *Sub trei dictaturi*, which has been translated into French as *Sous trois dictatures* (Paris, Editions Jean Vitiano, 1946). Although rigidly bound to the Marxist analysis, these studies are intelligently conceived and emphasize aspects of Rumanian life which are usually overlooked or concealed. It is doubtful however, whether Pătrăşcanu's intellectual communism can be identified with the outlook of the present regime.

Although the Ploughmen's Front was initially an independent agrarian movement, since 1944 it has been completely under the influence of the Communist party. The most detailed account of the Front is Gheorghe Micle

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

● 113 *Răscoala pământului: Istoria luptelor politice ale țăranimii române, 1933–1945* (Bucarest, Editura Frontul Plugarilor, 1945).

There is no satisfactory history of the Bessarabian question, that prolonged source of conflict between Rumania and Russia. Communist and Soviet views are to be found in Ch. Rakovsky, *Rumyniya i Bessarabiya, k semiletiyu anneksii Bessarabii* (Moscow, Izdanie Litizdata N.K.I.D., 1925); *Bessarabia . . . the Roumanian Hell* (published by the British Section of the International Class War Prisoners Aid, London, n.d.); A. Dolnik, *Bessarabiya pod vlastyu rumynskikh boyar, 1918–1940 gg.* (Ogiz-Gospoditizdat, 1945); and Akademiya nauk Soyuza SSR, Institut Geografii Akademii nauk SSSR i Moldavskii Nauchno-Issledovatelskii Institut, *Moldavskaya SSR* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1947). For the Rumanian side see Charles Upson Clark, *Bessarabia: Russia and Roumania on the Black Sea* (New York, Dodd, Mead, 1927); Andrei Popovici, *The Political Status of Bessarabia* (published for the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, by Ransdell, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1931); and *Facts and Comments Concerning Bessarabia, 1812–1940, Compiled by a Group of Roumanian Press Correspondents* (London, 1941).

Events after August 23, 1944, have been described by a number of American foreign correspondents, some of whom have written books: William B. King and Frank O'Brien, *The Balkans, Frontier of Two Worlds* (New York, Knopf, 1947); George Moorad, *Behind the Iron Curtain* (London, Latimer House, 1947); and Reuben H. Markham, *Rumania under the Soviet Yoke* (Boston, Meador, 1949). The last is much the most extensive, shows intimate and long familiarity with Rumania, but is marred by the author's intense personal feelings. Robert Bishop and E. S. Crayfield, *Russia Astride the Balkans* (New York, Robert M. McBride, 1948), is also a work of reportage rather than analysis; the two authors were U. S. intelligence officers in Rumania.

A bitter indictment of the Groza regime has been prepared by a Rumanian group in exile in the United States: the Rumanian National Committee, *Suppression of Human Rights in Rumania* (Washington, D.C., September, 1949).

The Soviet view of events in Rumania in 1944–45 may be found in K. Dimitrov, "Agrarnyi vopros i agrarnaya reforma v Rumynii," *Mirovoe Khozyaistvo i Mirovoya Politika*, No. 6 (1945), pp. 15–19; and Ilya Ehrenburg's chapter on Rumania in *Dorogi Evropy* (Moscow, 1946).

PERIODICALS

The publications of the International Institute of Agriculture (Rome), especially the *International Review of Agriculture*, are quite useful, though most of the information on Rumania has an official character which often limits rather than increases its reliability. The organ of the Green (Prague) International, *M.A.B. (Mezinárodní Agrární Bureau): Bulletin du Bureau International Agraire*, contains a number of articles on Rumania in the 1920's. It is of value, too, in giving the general outlook of the eastern European

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

peasant parties. The publications of the International Labour Office, the *International Labour Review* and *Industrial and Labour Information* have occasional items on social and labor conditions in Rumania. The first issue of the *International Journal of Agrarian Affairs* (London) (October, 1939) was entirely devoted to a series of articles on surplus agricultural population. *The Slavonic and East European Review* (London) has several articles on Rumania during the interwar period. For the years since 1945 *East Europe* (London), a periodical hostile to the present regimes behind the iron curtain, provides a weekly chronicle of events in Rumania. Among the pro-Soviet periodicals the most authoritative is the Cominform organ, *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, now published in Bucarest.

Among Rumanian magazines and newspapers the following have been consulted: *Viaţa românească*, at one time the leading periodical, containing numerous articles on social, political, and philosophical questions; *Argus* and *Finanţe şi Industrie*, economic and commercial journals; the party organs: *Viitorul* and *L'Indépendance roumaine* (Liberal), *Dreptatea* (National-Peasant), *Libertatea* (Social Democrat), and *Scânteia* and *România Liberă* (Communist); and the formerly independent newspapers: *Universul*, *Timpul*, *Jurnalul de dimineaţa*, and *Semnalul*.

OTHER WORKS CONSULTED

a. *General or Well-known Works and Technical Aids*

Arndt, H. W. *The Economic Lessons of the Nineteen-Thirties*. Oxford University Press, 1944.

Baykov, Alexander. *The Development of the Soviet Economic System*. Cambridge University Press, 1946.

Beloff, Max. *The Foteign Policy of Soviet Russia, 1929–1941*. 2 vols., Oxford University Press, 1947–49.

Borkenau, Franz. *The Communist International*. London, Faber, 1938.

Byrnes, James F. *Speaking Frankly*. London; New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Carr-Saunders, A. M. *World Population: Past Growth and Present Trends*. Oxford University Press, 1936.

Clark, Colin. *The Conditions of Economic Progress*. London, Macmillan, 1940.

Cohen, R. L. *The Economics of Agriculture*. Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Dareste, F. R., and P. *Les Constitutions modernes*. 4th ed., 6 vols., Paris, 1928–34.

David, Eduard. *Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft*. 2d ed., Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer, 1922.

Deutscher, I. *Stalin, a Political Biography*. Oxford University Press, 1949.

Dobb, Maurice H. *Soviet Economic Development since 1917*. London, Routledge and K. Paul, 1948.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 ED1 Rumania ED1

● 13 Fabian Society, International Research Section. *Hitler's Route to Bagdad.* London, G. Allen and Unwin, 1939.

Fischer, Louis. *Men and Politics, an Autobiography.* New York, Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1941.

Gunther, John. *Inside Europe.* London, Hamish Hamilton, 1936.

Hevesy, Paul de. *World Wheat Planning and Economic Planning in General.* Oxford University Press, 1940.

Hull, Cordell. *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull.* 2 vols., New York, Macmillan, 1948.

International Institute of Agriculture. *World Trade in Agricultural Products.* Rome, 1940.

Jasny, Naum. *The Socialized Agriculture of the USSR.* Stanford, Stanford University, Food Research Institute, "Grain Economics Series," No. 5, 1949.

Keeton, George W., and Schlesinger, Rudolf. *Russia and Her Western Neighbors.* London, Jonathan Cape, 1942.

Lenin, V. I. *Selected Works.* 12 vols., London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1936–39.

Macartney, C. A. *Hungary and Her Successors: the Treaty of Trianon and Its Consequences, 1919–1937.* Oxford University Press, 1937.

Marx, Karl. *Capital,* Vol. I, English trans. by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. London, 1887. Vol. III, English trans. by Ernest Untermann. Chicago, 1909.

Mitrany, David. *The Effect of the War in Southeastern Europe.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936.

Mosely, Philip E., *Face to Face with Russia.* Foreign Policy Association, Headline Series, No. 70, July–August, 1948.

Owen, Lancelot A. *The Russian Peasant Movement, 1906–17.* London, King, 1937.

Robinson, Geroid Tanquary. *Rural Russia under the Old Regime.* New York, London, and Toronto, Longmans, Green, 1932.

Royal Institute of International Affairs. *World Agriculture, an International Survey.* Oxford University Press, 1932.

Schmidt, Paul. *Statist auf diplomatischer Bühne, 1923–45; Erlebnisse des Chefdolmetschers im Auswärtigen Amt mit den Staatsmännern Europas.* Bonn, Athenäum-Verlag, 1949.

Sherwood, Robert E. *Roosevelt and Hopkins. An Intimate History.* New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Stalin, J. *Voprosy Leninizma.* 11th ed., Ogiz, Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo Politicheskoi Literatury, 1945.

Stettinius, Edward R., Jr. *Roosevelt and the Russians: the Yalta Conference.* New York, Doubleday, 1949.

United Nations, Research and Planning Division, Economic Commission for Europe. *Economic Survey of Europe in 1948.* Geneva, 1949.

United States, Department of State. *Nazi-Soviet Relations, 1939–1941.* Washington, D.C., 1948.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

Von Franges, Otto. *Die Bevolkerungsdichte als Triebkraft der Wirtschaftspolitik der südosteuropäischen Bauernstaaten*, in *Kieler Vorträge, gehalten im Institut für Weltwirtschaft an der Universität Kiel*, No. 59. Jena, 1939.

White, Leigh. *The Long Balkan Night*. New York, Scribner's, 1944.

b. *Miscellaneous Works on Rumania*

Académie Roumaine, *La Transylvanie*. Bucarest, 1938.

——. *La Dobroudja*. Bucarest, 1938.

Antim, St. *Chestiunea socială în România*. Bucarest, "La Roumanie," 1908.

Auboin, Roger. *Rapport annuel sur la situation financière et monétaire de la Roumanie*. Bucarest, 1935.

Baerlein, Henry, ed. *The Romanian Scene*. London, Muller, 1945.

Bussot, A. "Le Bloc des états agricoles de l'Europe centrale et orientale et son programme," *Revue d'économie politique*, 47 (1933), 1544–1558.

Calinescu, Armand. *Roumania, the Country of National Renaissance and of Royal Revolution*. Pamphlet in English, translated from a speech in the Chamber of Deputies, January 28, 1939.

Ciomac, Ion Luca. *Despre starile agrare din Transilvania sub regimul maghiar, şi cercetari asupră situaţiei exploatarilor agricole după reforma agrară*. Bucarest, 1931.

Cioriceanu, Georges D. *La Roumanie économique et ses rapports avec l'étranger de 1860 à 1915*. Paris, Marcel Giard, 1928.

Claudian, Ioan. *Alimentaţia poporului român în cadrul antropogeografiei şi istoriei economice*. Bucarest, Fundaţia "Regele Carol II," 1939.

Codrescu, Florin. *Essai de synthèse sur l'évolution du commerce extérieure de la Roumanie, 1918–1934*. Extract from the periodical, *Les Balkans*, Athens, 1934.

Colescu, L. *Progresele economice ale României îndeplenite sub domnia M.S. Regelui Carol I, 1866–1906*. Bucarest, 1907.

Dugdale, Mrs. Edgar. *The Hungaro-Rumanian Dispute. The Optants' Case before the League*. London, The Association for International Understanding, 1926.

Filitti, I. C. *Clasele sociale în trecutul românesc*. Bucarest, 1925.

Georgescu, C. C. *La Réforme agraire en Roumanie*. Paris, 1908.

Ghyka, Matila. *A Documented Chronology of Roumanian History from Pre-Historic Times to the Present Day*. Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 1941.

Giannini, Amadeo. *La costituzione romena*. Rome, 1928.

——. *Le Vicende della Rumania, 1878–1940*. Milan, 1940.

Giurescu, C. *Despre boieri*. Bucarest, Cartea Românească, 1920.

Graf, O. P. *Die Industriepolitik Alt-Rumäniens und die Grundlagen der Industrialisierung Gross-Rumäniens*. Bucarest, 1927.

Hausknecht, Louis. *Politica impositară a României după războiu*. Cernăuţi, 1931.

Hoffmann, Walter. *Südost-Europa: Bulgarien-Jugoslavien-Rumänien*. Leipzig, 1932.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

● 13 Hoffmann, Walter. *Rumänien von Heute. Ein Querschnitt durch Politik, Kultur, und Wirtschaft.* 2d ed., Leipzig, 1942.

Issacenco, A. G. *La Roumanie inconnue.* Berne, 1917.

Jaszi, Oscar. "The Economic Crisis in the Danubian States," *Social Research* (February, 1935), pp. 98–116.

Lémonon, Ernest. "La Situation économique de la Roumanie, 1918–1928," *Journal des économistes* (March 15, 1931), pp. 264–278.

Leon, Gh. N., *Struktur und Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten der rumänischen Volkswirtschaft.* Jena, 1941.

Lovrin, C. D. *Rumania Today.* London, 1945.

Micşuinescu, Emil Gr. *Die rumänische Getreideausfuhr.* Nürnberg, 1914.

Mitrany, David. "The New Rumanian Constitution," *The Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law,* 3rd ser., *6,* Pt. 1 (February, 1924), 110–119.

Obedenare, M. G. *La Roumanie économique d'après les données les plus récentes.* Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1876.

Raducanu, Mircea I. *Die Genossenschaftsbewegung in Rumänien.* Dresden, 1941.

Rădulescu-Motru, C. *Cultura română şi politicianismul.* Bucarest, n.d.

Rambaud, Benoit. *La Question des fermiers généraux en France et à l'étranger* (Paris, 1913).

Reithinger, Anton. "Grossdeutschland und Südosteuropa im Lichte der Statistik," *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv, 29* (1939), 129–139.

Rumanian Democratic Committee. *How Rumania Was Surrendered: Statements Made by M. Juliu Maniu, Leader of the National Peasant Party, and M. Constantin Bratianu, Leader of the National Liberal Party.* London, Favil Press, 1941.

Rumania, Ministry of Agriculture. *La Roumanie, 1866–1906.* Bucarest, SOCEC, 1907.

Rumer, Willy. *Die Agrarreformen der Donau-Staaten.* Innsbrück, 1927.

Schiff, Walter. *Die grossen Agrarreformen seit dem Kriege.* Vienna, 1926.

Sollohub, W. A. "The Conversion of Agricultural Debts in Roumania," *The Economic Journal, 42* (December, 1932), 588–594.

Strat, George. *Industria românească în cadrul economiei europene.* Bucarest, "Remus Cioflec," 1945.

Tătărescu, G. *Quatre années de gouvernement, 1933–1937, exposé fait devant le comité central du Parti National-Liberal le 1 novembre 1937.* Bucarest, 1937.

Thomas, P. J. *Les Roumains nos alliés?* Paris, F. Sorlot, 1938.

Tilea, V. V. *Iuliu Maniu, der Mann und das Werk.* Hermannstadt, 1927.

Union des Chambres de Commerce et d'Industrie de Roumanie. *La Roumanie économique en 1926.* Bucarest, F. Göbl et Fils, n.d.

Vararu, M. *Le Métayage en Roumanie.* Paris, M. Giard et E. Brière, 1915.

Waldeck, R. G. *Athene Palace Bucarest: Hitler's New Order Comes to Rumania.* London, Constable, 1943.

3: Roberts S-4 (no date)1951 EDl Rumania EDl

Year-Book of Agricultural Co-operation, 1930 (London), "Rumania: the State as Co-operator," pp. 404–428.

Zăroni, Romulus. *De ce nu trebue să fie plugarul român fascist.* Cluj, Viaţa Creştină, n.d.

113

page 400 is blank.

4:Fleure S-5 (no date)1936 ED1 Rumania ED1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Constantinesco, M.: L'Evolution de la Propriété Rurale et la Réforme Agraire en Roumanie (1925).

Cvijic, J.: La Péninsule Balcanique (1918).

East, W. G.: The Union of Moldavia and Wallachia, 1859 (1929).

Evans, I. L.: The Agrarian Revolution in Roumania (1924).

Iorga, N.: A History of Roumania (1925).

Madgearu, V.: Rumania's New Economic Policy (1930).

Martonne, E. de: La Valachie (1902).

Mihailescu, V.: Les Grandes Régions Morphologiques de la Roumanie (Buletinul Societatii Regale Romane de Geografie, vol. 50, 1931).

Mihailescu, V.: Une Carte des Principaux Types d'Habitat Rurale en Roumanie (B.S.R.G., vol. 46, 1927).

Mitrany, D.: The Land and the Peasant in Rumania (1930).

Opreanu, S.: Le Pays des Sicules (Travaux de l'Institut de Géographie de l'Université de Cluj, vol. III, 1929).

Oprescu, G.: Peasant Art in Roumania ("Studio," Autumn Number, 1929).

Parvan, V.: Dacia (1928).

Pittard, E.: La Roumanie (1917).

Seton-Watson, R. W.: A History of the Roumanians from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity (1934).

Wachner, H.: Judet Ciuc, samt Toplita und der Muresenge (Travaux de l'Institut de Géographie de l'Université de Cluj, vol. III, 1929).

[Page 80]

5: Fleure S-5 (no date)1939 EDl Rumania EDl

THE ARGEŞ DISTRICT

101 133 THE EXTENDED ROUMANIA that was organised after 1918 includes the old areas of Wallachia, Dobrogea, Moldavia, Bessarabia, Bukovina, Transylvania and Timişoara, of varied allegiance before the World War, but all containing from early historic times onwards a proportion of Roumanian-speaking people. Transylvania is the mountain bastion with the eastern Carpathians as its eastern boundary, the southern Carpathians or Transylvanian Alps as its southern edge, and the western Roumanian Carpathians or Bihor, etc., mountains on its western flank. Its mountainous frame and its hilly interior give it a very decidedly upland character, even if the Olt, the Maroş and the Szamoş, which drain it, have considerable systems of tributary valleys. Outside the bastion to the east Bukovina and Moldavia slope down to the great plain of eastern Europe, of which Bessarabia forms the flank west of the Dniestr. Behind the bastion to the west Timişoara stretches down to the Tisza, and forms the south-eastern flank of the middle Danubian plain. Outside the bastion on the south is Wallachia, sloping down towards the lower Danube, while beyond the considerable barrier formed by the lowest portion of the Danube and to the south-east, is the low plateau area of the Dobrogea.

● [113] IN A PREVIOUS study we gave in some measure a picture of rural life in the eastern Carpathians near the border between Transylvania and Moldavia, where the mountains barely reach 1,900 m. (say 6,200 feet), and the highest land is often in great expanses of pasture with deep valleys cut by the rival drainage systems of the two sides, which are separated by a number of passes that may indent the watershed. In the eastern Carpathians Roumanians and Szeklers, respectively Uniate and Roman Catholic, live in adjacent villages, and the former, especially, send flocks and herds to the highland pastures.

121 THIS STUDY is intended to deal more especially with what is thought to be a typical area of rural Wallachia, having an almost entirely Roumanian population attached to the Orthodox Church and living under circumstances differing

5: Fleure S-5 (no date)1939 EDl Rumania EDl

113

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GEOGRAPHY AND ECONOMICS

HERSENI TRAIAN: L'Organisation Pastorale en Roumanie. (Archives pour la science et la réforme sociales, 1936.)

MARTONNE, E. DE: La Vie Pastorale et la Transhumance dans les Carpathes Méridionales. (Zu Friederich Ratzels Gedächtnis, 1904.)

FLEURE, H. J. and PELHAM, R. A. (Editors): Eastern Carpathian Studies (1936).

DE MARTONNE, E.: La Valachie (Maps and Illustrations) (1902).

MADGEARU, V.: Rumania's New Economic Policy (1930).

HISTORY

CVIJIC, J.: *La Péninsule Balkanique (Paris, 1918).

EVANS, I. L.: The Agrarian Revolution in Roumania (excellent summary) (1924).

IORGA, N.: *A History of Roumania (T. Fisher Unwin, 1925).

PARVAN, V.: Dacia (outline of early civilisations of Carpatho-Danubian country. Illustrated. 1928).

SETON-WATSON, R. W.: A History of the Roumanians from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity (Cambridge U.P., 1934).

SOCIAL AND GENERAL

HIELSCHER AND GOGA: Rumania: Landscape, Buildings, National Life (F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1933).

OPRESCU, GEO.: *Peasant Art in Roumania. Fully illustrated (1929).

PITTARD, E.: La Roumanie. Illustrated. (Excellent for race types and peasant costumes.) (1917).

Stahel de Capitani: Rumanien (1925).

*Books marked * can be borrowed from the Le Play Society's Library. Postage must be refunded; books must be returned within fourteen days of receipt.

NOTE.—Should these books be unobtainable at any school, public, or other libraries, ask the librarian to apply to the NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY, Malet Place, London, W.C.1, for the loan of these books, mentioning that you are a member of the Le Play Society's Group.

505 648 [651] It is a cardinal principle of the Statute that the customs dues levied on goods must not be higher than the duties levied at frontier stations of the country concerned. The cost of improvements was to be met by navigation dues, these being assessed on the tonnage of ships, and not based on the goods transported.

Bratislava was fixed as the Headquarters for the Commission for the first five years, and it was laid down that thereafter, for five-year periods, other Danube towns were to be selected in rotation.

Since the outbreak of this war, Germany has virtually controlled the Danube, has abolished the C.I.D., and set up the "Consulting Committee for Danube Affairs above Brăila."

C.E.D. (European Danube Commission)

[503] This Commission was constituted under the Treaty of Paris in 1856 with Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia and Turkey as members, for the express purpose of dredging the mouths of the Danube below Isaccea, and leaving the various channels free from all obstructions to navigation. It was apparently expected that this preliminary task would take two years, and the life of the Commission was originally fixed for that period; but, by a series of later treaties, it was kept in being up to the outbreak of the Great War.

In 1918 the Central Powers set up their own Danube Commission, membership naturally being restricted to those Powers and their allies.

By the Treaty of Versailles the European Commission was reconstituted with Great Britain, France, Italy and Rumania as provisional members; and by the Convention of July 21st, 1921, was placed on a more permanent basis. The provisional membership of the four countries was confirmed and all the powers of the original Commission restored. A proviso added that any nation whose commercial interests in that part of the river warranted their being represented on the Commission could be admitted. In fact, no country was admitted under this proviso until the inclusion of Germany in August, 1938.

In August, 1938, an arrangement was signed at Sinaia relative to the exercise of the Powers of the C.E.D. In effect the Powers of the Commission were transferred to the Rumanian Government who were to set up a "Maritime Danube Board." This board, under Article 5, was "to be responsible for the preparation and execution of plans for works on the maritime Danube and at the mouths for levying dues and dispensing of the yield thereof."

In September, 1940, Germany summoned a conference at Vienna for the purpose of regulating Danube shipping anew, and eliminating Great Britain and France from membership of the Commission.

● [113] [For further information see *La Commission Européenne du Danube et son Œuvre de 1856 à 1931* (Paris 1931); Treaty of Versailles, Articles 331-339, 346-353; Treaty Series No. 38 (1939) Cmd. 6068, and Treaty Series 38 (1939), Cmd. 6069.]

E. TELECOMMUNICATIONS

I. Pre-War Situation

1. Telegraph and Telephones

206 The telegraph system of Rumania was controlled by the Ministry of Communications, the telephone by the Societatea Română de Telefoane, a subsidiary of the International Telephone and

[456]